DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 100 CS 200 349

AUTHOR	Haugh, Oscar M., Ed.
TITLE	Revisiting Basic Issues in English Education: Selected Papers and Addresses Delivered at the Conference on English Education (6th, University of Colorado, March 28-30, 1968). Part I.
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	72p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801 (Stock No. 20578, $2.00 non-member, $1.80 member)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Creative Activities; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; *English Education; *English Instruction; Grammar; Language Instruction; Literary Criticism; Methods Courses; Microteaching; Secondary Education; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Educators; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Guidance; Teachers Colleges; Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS	English Teacher Preparation Study; ETPS; Florida State University; Verbal Reaction Behavior Log

ABSTRACT

The 11 papers collected in this book provide an analysis of a number of issues basic to English education. J. W. Patrick Creber discusses "rigour" in creative work and the question of "subject-centered" versus "student-centered" curriculums in British schools; Francis G. Townsend describes the working relationships between the departments of English and English Education at Florida State University; James D. Barry analyzes some of the difficulties of implementing the guidelines of the English Teacher Preparation Study; Donald D. Small discusses the content of methods courses in small colleges; Alan L. Madsen considers what instruction English teachers should have in literary critical theory; Alfred L. Papillon takes up the problems of a curriculum sequence in modern grammars for English teachers; Frank J. Zidonis studies the curriculum, learning theory, and teacher strategy for language instruction at the secondary level; Earl Seidman points out the values and limitations of microteaching; Sister M. Philippa Coogan surveys new materials and methods for helping and evaluating student teachers; Gordon M. A. Mork explains the use of the Verbal Reaction Behavior Log (VRBL) as a basis for evaluating student teachers; and Bryant Fillion presents methods of better preparing classroom teachers for the supervision of student teachers. (This document previously announced as ED 025 522.) (LH)

ED 017100

REVISITING BASIC ISSUES IN ENGLISH EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Selected Papers and Addresses Delivered at the

SIXTH CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

University of Colorado

March 28-30, 1968

Part I

OSCAR M. HAUGH
University of Kansas
Editor

Published for
CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION
by
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
508 South Sixth Street Champaign, Illinois 61820

Sixth
CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION
1968

Program Chairman: John S. Simmons, Florida State University
Assistant Chairman: Jean C. Sisk, Baltimore County Public Schools, Towson, Maryland
Local Chairman: Roy P. Ludtke, University of Colorado
Program Committee:
Bruce C. Appleby, Southern Illinois University
Kenneth L. Donelson, Arizona State University
Bessie Etheridge, Washington, D. C., Public Schools
James T. Fleming, University of California, Los Angeles
Richard L. Larson, University of Hawaii
Mary Columbro Rodgers, Trinity College, Washington, D. C.
Sheila Schwartz, State University of New York, College at New Paltz
Hazel Browne Williams, University of Missouri at Kansas City
Charles E. Wilson, University of Alabama

Editorial Services
Cynthia H. Smith
NCTE Headquarters

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 65-2139
SBN Number: 8141-20578
NCTE Stock Number: 20578

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS C
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRA
BY
National Council
Teachers of Englis
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERA
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OI
OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUC
OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES
MISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Copyright 1968
National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street Champaign, Illinois 61820

INTRODUCTION

In a number of respects the Sixth Annual Conference on English Education established new records: the total attendance reached an all-time high of over 500, and more members participated in more individually scheduled meetings than ever before. As a result, the number of papers presented reached a point where it was decided that two pamphlets rather than one should be published in 1968. In addition, a number of CEE members contributed additional papers during the year.

This publication, which will be known as Part I, is entitled *Revisiting Basic Issues in English Education.* Its companion, Part II, is of comparable length and bears the title of *Teaching the Teacher of English.*

The eleven papers in Part I do not cover all of the "Basic Issues," nor was it intended that they do so. What they do include is an analysis of a number of issues that are basic to English education. The reader will be interested in Creber's account of such basic issues as reconciling the "subject-centred" and "student-centred" curriculums in British schools as well as his discussion of the need for putting more "rigour" into creative work.

Among the basic questions in English education in America, the following are explored: Is it English *and* or is it English *vs.* English education? Should teachers be taught a single system of grammar or more than one? Should we implement the Guidelines of the Teacher Preparation Study? Can the methods course in the small college be salvaged? What instruction should English teachers have in literary critical theory? What are the values as well as the limitations of micro-teaching? How can we more properly evaluate student teaching? How can we make student teaching more worthwhile?

In the pages that follow, the reader may not find the answers that he would prefer to the foregoing questions. What he will find are some "professorial punches" at a number of the basic problems which many CEE members are trying to resolve.

Oscar M. Haugh
University of Kansas

National Council of Teachers of English

CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

Executive Committee, 1968-1969

William H. Evans, Southern Illinois University, *Chairman,* 1968-1970
Stanley B. Kegler, University of Minnesota, *Vice Chairman,* 1968-1970
Thomas L. Barton, Washington State Department of Public Instruction, Olympia
Alfred L. Crabb, Jr., University of Kentucky
Stephen Dunning, University of Michigan
Edmund J. Farrell, University of California, Berkeley
George H. Henry, University of Delaware
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois (Chairman, 1966-1968)
Arno Jewett, United States Office of Education (1962-1968)
Lois S. Josephs, Carnegie-Mellon University
Geraldine E. LaRocque, Teachers College, Columbia University
Arnold Lazarus, Purdue University
Richard A. Meade, University of Virginia
Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin (Vice Chairman, 1966-1968)
Virginia M. Reid, Oakland Public Schools, California
Ruth G. Strickland, Indiana University (1962-1968)

Secretary-Treasurer, Robert F. Hogan, Executive Secretary, NCTE
Editor, Oscar M. Haugh, University of Kansas
Assistant Editor, Shirley M. Carriar, Colorado State College

CONTENTS

Introduction iii
Oscar M. Haugh

Redirection in the Teaching of English 1
J. W. Patrick Creber

English and English Education at Florida State 9
Francis G. Townsend

Implementing the Guidelines of the English Teacher Preparation Study 13
James D. Barry

Toward a Research Conscience in the Small College Methods Course 19
Donald D. Small

Literary Critical Theory and the English Education Specialist 25
Alan L. Madsen

A Curriculum Sequence in Modern Grammars for English Teachers 33
Alfred L. Papillon

Language Instruction at the Secondary Level 39
Frank J. Zidonis

Micro-Teaching in English Education: Some Basic Questions 47
Earl Seidman

The Well-Prepared Student Teacher 55
Sister M. Philippa Coogan, B.V.M.

Using the Verbal Reaction Behavior Log (VRBL) as a Basis for Evaluating Student Teachers 59
Gordon M. A. Mork

The Preparation of Classroom Teachers for Supervision of Student Teachers 65
Bryant Fillion

Redirection in the Teaching of English

J. W. Patrick Creber, *Exeter University, England*

To give a "British view" poses an interesting variety of difficulties. In the first place one must note the paucity of objective factual evidence. There is no survey, and no published statement by consensus, to bear out my hunches about what is typical British practice or to distinguish practice in 1968 from, say, practice ten years ago. In the second place, my selection of themes must be influenced by what I know, or think I know, of American practice, and it is inevitable that the things one hears about practice in another country are misleading and possibly dangerous. Since one most readily remembers features (a) which—by their alienness—shock, or (b) which accord perfectly with one's own assumptions, the picture one's mind builds up is often a distorted one. Thinking about, and attitudes to, other countries constitute notoriously fertile ground for the creation of stereotypes which one clings to in spite of reason. The persistence of French belief about the permanence of English fog—though one could at the moment attribute this to the Machiavellian influence of de Gaulle—basically is due to the fact that they *like* to believe it, just as Englishmen enjoy believing in a French diet solidly based on frogs' legs and snails and the Scotsman's on haggis, whiskey, and porridge.

If one source of distortion is, then, the imperfect and unconsciously selective way in which one *receives* evidence, another source is at the *transmission* end. Even in England, a person not involved in teaching will get an unbalanced picture of what goes on in most classrooms. The voices that succeed in making themselves heard—and that, commercially, are worth encouraging—are rarely exponents of any golden mean but rather apostles of salvation, or prophets of doom. Quite obviously by the time the message has crossed the Atlantic its claim to represent the true picture has not been strengthened; on the contrary, the natural processes of oversimplification are likely to encourage the idea that in England we have all sat at the feet of Holbrook, have abjured the normal methods of pedagogic evaluation, and are now all engaged in an almost orgiastic creative splurge wherein, in our quieter moments, we give ourselves up to the gentle pleasures of amateur psycho-analysis of the infants committed to our charge. As usual in such cases, there is just about enough truth in this picture to make it thoroughly misleading and unfair. An American parallel might be the picture of all American teachers, as at the feeding of the five thousand, in some desert place, drinking the words of Marshall McLuhan.

I have laboured this because it seems worth labouring at a time when we may kid ourselves that we know each other better than we really do. One important thing that we have in common, a matter of fact, needs emphasis

at this point—the awful gap between the best of current practice and the average situation. I have to understand what Americans tell me against a background in which "At the present time fewer than half of the English teachers in our schools can claim completion of a college major in their subject." Now, there is no English counterpart to the Report of the Commission on English, *Freedom and Discipline in English,* from which that statement is quoted. A close study of schools in one area carried out by the University of Newcastle on Tyne does, however, present facts that are not untypical, offer some parallel to the American situation described above, and deserve therefore to be remembered. The Newcastle survey found that in the non-selective schools in the area less than a quarter of those who taught "some English" could be called specialists in any sense, as compared to about 60 percent teaching in the grammar (selective) schools. The survey found that over the schools as a whole 33 percent of all teachers taught some English; that a large majority of schools included grammar (generally formal) in their English program for the first five years; that over three-fourths of them used scrappy comprehension test material; and that in general there was heavy reliance on a multiplicity of textbooks.

If you will therefore bear in mind the inadequate factual evidence at my disposal, my inevitable subjective unreliability, and the unsatisfactory or unideal average English teaching situation, I may safely concern myself with a few of the themes that are currently exercising the minds of an enlightened and substantial minority of English teachers in Britain. I was tempted initially to look at different class activities and try to bring out the characteristically British slant on each. I rejected this partly because—although I have been listening hard ever since I arrived—I did not feel capable of sustaining the comparison that would have been required nor sufficiently conversant with the "American" view of each activity, if such indeed exists, to do it justice. Inevitably also, such a procedure would have meant running out of time long before completing my task. Instead, by selecting topics of wider generality than specific class activities, I hope to cover more ground and perhaps to emphasise more those pre-occupations and attitudes we share than those which divide us.

Our essential common concern is reflected in the title of the report from which I quoted earlier, *Freedom and Discipline in English.* If one thinks of a pendulum swinging between the two points indicated in this title, it is only natural that it should have reached a different stage in Britain from that reached over here. Its momentum is inevitably the product of different forces or pressures—not merely academic but also social, economic, and philosophical. Whatever the point reached on the arc, however, I think healthy English teaching at any moment, in any country, depends on the tension between freedom and discipline and upon attempts to reconcile the two. I think we will never succeed, or we have failed; success lies in the energetic striving towards reconciliation, in the bearing of both sources of criteria in mind.

There are a number of aspects of this question that offer themselves for discussion, and of these I have selected two: *knowledge* and *feeling.*

Dealing with the first, I shall concentrate on three sub-aspects: (a) common ground on this topic, (b) some distinctive "British" attitudes, and (c) an individual appraisal, modification, or re-direction of the British view.

Dealing with the second, I shall concentrate on the question of how to bring more rigour into creative work and on the place of the emotions in the education of the able student.

Inevitably there must be overlap between the main themes.

1. (a) Common Ground on Knowledge

As a superficial impression, there appears to be little common ground between the Americans and British on that issue. John Dixon in his report on the Dartmouth Seminar opens his chapter on knowledge by quoting Nelson Francis' remark that "with regard to 'knowledge' the two delegations passed each other in mid-Atlantic." Dixon goes on to give a concise statement of the position in both countries, as seen from an external viewpoint. In England, he contends, we are witnessing a break away from an educational tradition that threw the weight on examination syllabuses, rigorous and early specialism, and academic knowledge. Thus we now find a "new emphasis on *experience* and on the *operational* use of language to handle, order and come to terms with it."

Meanwhile, though sympathetic to this, opinion in the States—which we associate with the encouragement of pragmatic learning, general education, and progressive schools—is now increasingly pre-occupied "with the danger . . . of a chaotic approach to operational English associated with a 'child-centred' curriculum in which the major concern was social adjustment and not a child's growth in intellectual, imaginative and linguistic power."

From this kind of summary, it must seem that the pendulum is swinging in different directions, that there is little common ground. At the first reading of Herbert Muller's engaging account of the Dartmouth Seminar, one has the impression of the British, a compact body like one of the famous squares in the battle of Waterloo, reacting awkwardly, irritably, or coyly whenever the question of knowledge or "content" arose. A closer reading of Muller's *The Uses of English* will tend to modify this impression, however. Thus, on page 14 he describes how, during the debate, "the proponents of the subject-centered and the student-centered curriculum drew closer together. The British, after all, were inevitably teaching some 'content' or 'knowledge'; the Americans were also much concerned about the growth of the child and the harm done by drills in lifeless knowledge." Similarly he reports other areas of considerable agreement, for example on the kinds of content that are not appropriate to the literature course or on the need to break down arbitrary divisions or compartments within the subject itself.

It is quite obvious that impressions of wide divergence between the American and British viewpoints sometimes were the result of the delusion that we speak the same language, though we have widely different background experience—which is what, in fact, determines the overtones and emotive meaning of words we use.

We need perhaps also to look more rigorously at what we mean by knowledge. The wide variety of ways in which we use the word "to know" would alert us to the dangers. I suspect that some disagreements have been centred on misunderstandings—in particular on the limitation of "knowledge" to "knowledge of fact." Yet when Dwight Burton writes about literature and the heightened mind or Robert Heilman about literature as "feeling knowledge," they are drawing attention to an area of knowledge in terms that are very easily compatible with much enlightened thinking in England.

1. (b) Distinctive British View of Knowledge

By all this I do not mean to say that there are not attitudes to knowledge that we may meaningfully label British. Some of these emerged clearly at the seminar and are perhaps better seen as different emphases than different viewpoints.

I would note from the reports on the seminar, and endorse as fairly typical, two points of particular importance.

1. The British experience of a curriculum dominated by the neat pseudo-logic of textbooks has resulted in a reaction against too systematised programs of any kind.

2. The British tendency now would be, as Muller clearly indicates, to look for the principle of order in the psychological development of the child, while Americans may tend to look more to subject matter or objective principles of knowledge.

It is probably hard for Americans to realise just how schizoid or at least ambivalent the English are in their attitude to learning. The academic grammar school tradition has been widely valued but not widely understood. The Englishman, whose main pride has been in his common sense, has had little intuitive understanding of what the scholar is about; his most characteristic attitude to learning is perhaps best indicated by stock phrases such as "too clever by half," as if intellectual power and integrity of character rarely go together.

To some extent I see a danger of the current British line on English teaching proving too congenial, of its convincing Britons for the wrong reasons —through its appeal to our common sense, pandering to an instinctive preference for "the practical" at the expense of the academic. It is too easy to extend too far Whitehead's famous criticism of the "paralysis of thought induced by the aimless accumulation of knowledge, inert and unutilised."

The most enlightened teaching in England has, I think, benefitted from the Dartmouth Seminar; while the resistance to learning *about* remains, a deeper interest in what is involved in learning *how to*—in the stages when conceptualisation is needed in order to foster further development—has begun to emerge.

1. (c) Personal Modification of the "British View"

For my own part, I would subscribe to Professor Heilman's dictum that knowledge begets interest as well as interest knowledge. Child-centred

and subject-centred curricula may be compatible; I believe they are. I would place them in that order of priority, but at the same time I would argue that child-centred education must include the designing of situations in which children become *conscious* of needs—specifically, needs to grow in intellectual, imaginative, and linguistic power. If conceptual frames of reference are introduced into these situations, I see no reason why child-centred should mean soft-centred.

We need always to remember, however, that the roots of the awarenesses that we want are as much affective and intuitive as cognitive and generalised. While the emotions have been, thanks to a number of writers in England, receiving recently a fairer amount of attention, the question of intuition has been less explicitly explored. One of the most provocative sections of Jerome Bruner's *Process of Education* is that in which he urges the need to foster hypothesis and intuition and comments on the way in which guessing has been consistently frowned upon. In passing, I would note that people only guess happily in a confidence-inspiring situation, a situation in which there are other colours beside black and white. Free-ranging, speculative enquiry is not something we should want to allow to the sciences alone. This is but one reason why the major part of good English teaching lies in the art of questioning—"Craftie Questiones are the Minde's Whetstones."

A technique based upon questioning presupposes that the child has something to contribute, that, with help, he is capable of groping his own way towards the light. The process takes time, of course, and is uneasily compatible with a content-dominated curriculum where the teacher's job is seen as the instructor, from his wisdom, of the ignorant—if not swine, then perhaps little pigs in front of him.

One of the topics on which the teacher traditionally gave such instruction was form, ranging from matters of elementary syntax to consideration of literary genres. A long succession of early composition manuals made the assumption that the form and the manner were crucial, the content of minor importance; this content indeed was often *given* in exhaustive note form, the pupils' task being to "knock it all into shape." We can trace the same approach even now in schools where children are rigorously taught to build discussion essays on a *pro* and *con* plan, without ever having the experience of live discussion. I have known primary school teachers who still talk to gullible ten-year-olds in terms of "compositions" that have an introduction, development, and conclusion.

2. Feeling

As I have already suggested, "creative" work is probably the aspect of the British English curriculum that Americans most readily think of. I should like to examine, therefore, a few aspects of English and the education of the emotions, including in this category both literature and various types of writing, in order to emphasise areas in which there is, or ought to be, a trend towards more rigour.

It is hardly necessary to labour the point that in Britain the reaction

against "inert knowledge" is in full swing, that the emphasis is on knowing how rather than knowing about. As usual, however, there is the danger of oversimplification; we *still* particularly need to ask ourselves how knowledge can beget interest, as well as interest knowledge. Interest-dominated or child-centred curricula can present absurdities, and much nonsense in particular has been written about "relevance," to say nothing of "stimulation."

Relevance is too easily and too often invoked as if it were a merely external and superficial quality inherent in the *topic*, as if the child living in Gas St. must read poems about the gas works. We cannot ensure relevance without some proper insight into the children we teach or without insight into literature at our disposal. If we accept the child's own standard of relevance, we shall never extend him.

Superficially, the fact that *Hamlet* is set in Denmark, is couched in somewhat archaic language, and deals with sundry murders may make us feel it to be "irrelevant" to the lad from a small provincial town, whose language resources are limited and who has never killed anyone.

This assumes however that the language difficulty must be insuperable; but need it be? Many of our statements about what plays can and cannot be done *assume* a relatively traditional classroom treatment. Aside from the language problems, it is at least arguable that much of the emotional material in *Hamlet* is *potentially* highly relevant to adolescents.

Rather similarly, the superficiality of some ideas that are dignified by the title "curriculum development" poses the need for both philosophical and psychological analysis. In English for example we come across theme-centred work where the thinking *ended* with the discovery of the suitable theme. We need more stringent enquiry. Given that the topic area is one where motivation is relatively easy, what levels of thinking, what attitudes, what skills, what knowledge are we hoping to foster?

Happily, the kinds of questions I have been asking in the context of curriculum development work are attracting more attention, and I have noted in, for example, teachers' discussion of objectives a trend towards greater rigour and more precise definition. The situation is still not particularly hopeful, however, in the field of affective education that interests me most—creative writing.

Before I turn to this, however, let me clear up one possible misconception: I doubt whether this activity is yet either practised or believed in by the *majority* of English teachers in British secondary schools, though the position in primary schools is much better. As Dixon has recognised, this aspect of the education of the emotions, like various other "reforms," has aroused a good deal of understandable anxiety. Thus a writer to the *Times Educational Supplement* was moved to complain, "The beautiful, accurate dull and dead compositions of the past have been replaced, not by lively enjoyable English, but by page after page of ill-spelt, messy, rambling rubbish."

This is hardly a true reflection of the state of affairs, but, in so far as it contains an element of truth, the exponents of creative writing have themselves to blame, basically, I think, for three reasons—

1. They have put forward criteria for judging such work that were either manifestly irrelevant or wilfully obscure.

2. Connected with the first reason, in their enthusiasm for this activity they have succeeded in isolating creative writing from other activities to which it should be related.

3. They have failed to see that the psychological and literary arguments they adduce in favour of creative writing, arguments most of which I support, must, if correct, apply to the whole of the ability range. It is unfortunate that they have permitted, even fostered, the idea that the education of the emotions is a kind of consolation prize or escape route for the intellectually underdeveloped. Paradoxically, while arguing that we have overemphasised the cerebral and the rational at the expense of the emotional elements in education, they are tacitly perpetuating this state of affairs.

Of the first of these reasons for partial failure, there is little more to say except that a teacher, though he may have stepped down from his authoritarian dais, is still professionally concerned with evaluation. The second and third reasons merit further consideration, however. The virtual isolation of creative writing is a result of a too restricted view of imaginative activity. Such activity is concerned with the life of the senses, with remembering or re-living experience, but it is also stimulated in quite other ways and involved with other intellectual processes: with shaping, moulding; with elaborating and playing with ideas and concepts. It is in this domain that cognitive and affective elements may come together.

T. S. Eliot has taken Matthew Arnold to task for distinguishing too bluntly between the processes of creation and criticism. Effectively, by isolating creative writing we have fallen into the same trap, though we had fallen into it, in fact, long before the present "creative boom." Our authoritarian approach traditionally assumed that *we only* were the judges of what our pupils wrote, and there seems some risk that we may be perpetuating that assumption. John Dixon has most lucidly summarised the feeling of members of the seminar about the need for *workshop* English, with activity flowing naturally from one mode to another, mine—speech—writing, etc. To me another important feature of workshop English must be craftsmanship—the creation of a situation in which we have active junior poets, novelists, etc. And if in any real sense they are to be such, they must be taught to share in the evaluative process.

An approach which deliberately seeks to involve the child in evaluating, as well as emoting, is one that combines freedom and discipline. It is moreover the only way in which I can see how to extend and challenge and excite the ablest children. I mentioned earlier the nonsense that has been talked about *stimulating* children; one feature that most accounts of "stimuli" have lacked is any reference to the abstract idea, the technical challenge of a style or mode of writing. Presumably, since these to some extent depend on reference to "models," it is assumed that such writing is not creative—not "original." Yet I suppose if my speech were truly original, I would have achieved no communication.

I am particularly concerned at the slow progress of affective education in British selective schools. I sense too that a section of American professional opinion remains equally resistant to any emphasis on the affective education of the abler student. A speaker at one of the conference sessions remarked that in English "we are not *playing*"—a statement that recalls a parent I once heard complain that his son was *enjoying* English. The grind doctrine lives on, on both sides of the Atlantic. This is not the place to attempt, yet again, to repudiate it, but I do want most energetically to argue that creative work can provide a context or framework for the introduction and effective learning of almost any significant concept about language or literature. This needs careful planning and proper attention to developmental stages. It requires also the abrogation of authoritarian attitudes and the fostering of the confidence, the zestful awareness, without which fluency will never develop.

Finally, there is another reason for desiring a new emphasis on the education of the emotions in the teaching of able children. It is from their ranks that our future teachers will come. The dais is disappearing, but the process is lamentably slow. One reason for this is the neglect of emotional—therapeutic, if you like—activity in our grammar schools, a neglect that all too often is perpetuated in our teacher training. Every significant book I have read on English has emphasised the change in the teachers' role in a way that implies clearly the need to de-inhibit intending teachers so that when they come into their classrooms they do not feel bound to leave half of their personalities outside. For this we need creative activities engaged in for their own sake to develop the student-teachers' expressive potential. This will only happen when such activities are viewed as of fundamental importance, instead of mere frills that can be accommodated when academic considerations permit, an attitude still very common. The prospect of generations of future teachers inhibitedly utilising techniques designed to de-inhibit their pupils is too horrible to contemplate. *Corruptio optimi, pessima.*

English and English Education at Florida State

FRANCIS G. TOWNSEND, *Florida State University*

It has been said that all academic problems are personnel problems. It is certainly true that a faculty split into warring factions will not produce much of value under any policy of any sort. On the other hand, a harmonious faculty, however modest its talents, will function reasonably well under any set of rules or under no rules at all. It follows that the first rule for relationships between people in English education and people in departments of English is also the only rule necessary—they must make up their minds to get along together.

Now that it has been said, it sounds terribly stupid, not because it is false but because it seems almost too much to expect. There is a long, dreary record of fussing and fighting which needs no elaboration; people in both fields can document it out of their own experience. There is also a record of pious proclamations designed to attract foundation support but never intended for internal consumption. Yet the problem is not really difficult. For any campus where it seems so, I would suggest a two-part program: first, a two-year ban on ringing resolutions; second, a new start based on a radical new principle called mutual respect.

I suppose I have been asked to speak on this problem because the working relationships between the departments of English and English Education at the Florida State University have been, on the whole, sound and fruitful. Policies that work at one university may not work at another. What has worked at Florida State may not work elsewhere. Still, a few suggestions for improved relationships might emerge from the Florida State experience.

The two departments, English and English Education, owe much to a quiet settlement between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, a settlement which was arrived at about a generation ago but never written down, as far as I know. It was a settlement designed to curb empire building. Nothing will rip a campus apart faster than a drive by one college, or by a group of departments, to build an empire at the expense of other colleges and departments. To prevent empire building, there has to be a clear, simple understanding of where the responsibilities of one department end and those of another begin. At Florida State the College of Education and its departments are entrusted with all pedagogy in grades K through 12. They are not to teach subject matter, which is entrusted to the subject matter departments. These departments, most of them in the College of Arts and Sciences, are also entrusted with all pedagogy above grade 12.

Such a settlement is by no means unique, nor is it guaranteed to beget harmony. In some fields which shall remain nameless, the Florida State ex-

perience has not been happy. But perhaps the failures have been the failures of people, not of policy. The policy itself seems almost self-evident; who can argue with it, provided it is fairly executed? Fairly executed, it will produce certain consequences, the most conspicuous of which is the general air of friendliness and cooperation. When new faculty members are informed that there are no feuds between the Deweys and the Bestors, they seem surprised, itself a commentary on the persistence of stupidity.

Less conspicuous but more important is the subtle change in attitudes. When a College of Education is forced to rely on subject matter departments for about seventy-five percent of the training of its teachers, the faculty of that college become very much concerned about the departments in Arts and Sciences, about the individual professors in those departments, and about the curricula of those departments. In the same way, when a department in the College of Arts and Sciences finds its enrollments shifting significantly in one direction or another or discovers that it must offer new kinds of courses in order to train teachers in its area, its faculty become interested in teacher training, in certification requirements, in the faculty of the College of Education, and in its curriculum. It is not surprising that over the years the liberal arts faculty have become deeply involved in teacher training, nor that the College of Education has become more and more subject-matter oriented, nor that the University Committee on Teacher Education should consist half of English, Social Science, and Natural Science specialists from the College of Education and half of people from the departments of English, Government, Physics, etc., nor that the chairman should be the man who places interns.

Once an air of mutual respect is established, minor problems have a way of taking care of themselves. For example, who decides whether a proposed course belongs in English or English Education? Which department should offer "American Fiction since 1945"? Are there not valid reasons for teaching *The Catcher in the Rye* in either department? Does it not take the wisdom of Solomon to decide such questions? No, under certain conditions such questions are easily solved.

Here is how one was solved last fall. The Department of English Education proposed a course in methods of teaching composition. The course was approved by the College of Education and forwarded to the Vice-President in charge of academic affairs. The syllabus stressed the inculcation of rhetorical principles. Since rhetoric and theories of rhetoric as taught to college students lie within the province of the Department of English, the Vice-President sent the papers through channels to that department, which already offers several courses in the area. I checked with the Department of English Education. The proposed course was a valid methods course aimed at prospective high school teachers; the rhetoric was included in order to insure that every student had an adequate basis in theory. A very slight revision of the syllabus sufficed to clear up any misapprehension. Thus a few minutes on the telephone ironed out a matter which might have caused friction.

To return to *The Catcher in the Rye,* which of the two departments should teach it? The answer is obvious: both should teach it. Studied as a

cultural phenomenon, it belongs in the Department of English; studied as a means of developing adolescent interest in fiction, it belongs in English Education.

Of course you have all noticed that my answers to jurisdictional problems are no answers at all. But what answers are there? These simple answers will do if there is good faith on both sides; if there is not, no subtlety of analysis or rigor of definition will produce a workable policy.

Let us readily admit that it is difficult to distinguish between matters which are English and matters which are English Education. Now let us observe the logical consequence: it is very often difficult to tell whether a given course should be taught by a professor of English or by a professor of English Education. In that case, in a university where there is mutual respect between the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences, there should be a good deal of teaching across departmental lines. At Florida State the candid admission that we have mutual interests and mutual responsibilities has led to appointments and assignments across departmental and college lines. For example, we have on campus this year a federally sponsored Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, directed by the head of the Department of English Education. During the fall and winter quarters a visiting professor of English taught English courses in that program. In the spring quarter he will teach another English course, this time for the Department of English, though most of his students will be English Education majors and graduate students. During the fall and winter quarters one of our assistant professors of English counseled participants in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program. In the spring quarter he will teach a course in that program, a course entitled "Literature for Teachers" and bearing an English department number. In this same spring quarter an associate professor of English Education will teach English 383, "Applied English Linguistics."

What of the summer quarter? One of our senior professors of English will receive a half-time appointment from the Department of English Education, in return for which he will teach one course for their graduate students and will also serve on various committees. The course he will teach, however, will be an English course, and the other half of his pay will come from the Department of English in the form of a research assignment, the subject of his research being language development in high school students. And in every quarter of every year the head of the Department of English Education holds an appointment as a professor of English.

What is true of the faculty is also true of the students. At Florida State a student who wants to teach English can major in English in the College of Education or in the College of Arts and Sciences. If he majors in the College of Arts and Sciences he must take several courses in the older forms of English literature, and he must intern. If he majors in the College of Education, he does not have to take a foreign language, and he need not take many courses in older English literature, but he must intern, and he must take more English courses than a liberal arts major in English. So what difference does it make which college he graduates from?

At Florida State it is bad form for a counselor to proselyte for one college as opposed to another. In the last twelve years I have counseled more students than I care to remember on just this point. Always I point out the differences and the similarities between the two majors and the advantages and disadvantages of each. The decision belongs to the student. Is it good counseling to contend otherwise?

Every now and then we get a new counselor in one or another department who thinks that in order to have a triumph you must tear down the walls of somebody's city. Like the pots of Omar Khayyam, we say, "Gently, brother, gently, pray." With faith, all things are possible; without it, nothing is possible.

Implementing the Guidelines of the English Teacher Preparation Study

JAMES D. BARRY, *Loyola University, Chicago*

The Guidelines of the English Teacher Preparation Study[1] read like the counsels of perfection. Would that I had had a teacher in high school who fulfilled these qualifications. Would that I were such a person.

But we must, of course, have an ideal toward which to aim. As Samuel Johnson has told us:

> Some deficiency must be forgiven all, because all are men; and more must be allowed to pass uncensured in the greater part of the world, because none can confer upon himself abilities, and few have the choice of situations proper for the improvement of those abilities which nature has bestowed: it is, however, reasonable to have *perfection* in our eye; that we may always advance towards it, though we know it never can be reached.[2]

The Guidelines, we all realize, can be used for a variety of purposes. Importantly, they can provide ferment within the profession—the kind of ferment, it is hoped, that results in thought, and the kind of thought that results in intelligent change and improvement. Again, the Guidelines should be helpful to agencies like state departments of education, which can find here a basis for evaluation of both institutional programs and individual applications for certification. Also, the Guidelines should aid those institutions preparing college teachers of English to formulate programs that will help these college teachers become better preparers of English teachers for all levels. My focus in this paper, however, will be on how the Guidelines can help English and education departments of colleges and universities prepare better teachers of English for our elementary and secondary schools.

I shall discuss the need for developing in our students and ourselves a concern for the future of the profession, the importance of our heeding the Dartmouth conference (the 1966 Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English), and ways of implementing the Guidelines in our teaching of literature, methods, writing, and language. Too many teachers arrive at their teaching job—or, if they are lucky, at their student teaching—only to discover what teaching English really means. Too many of our high school English teachers, for example, arrive in their classrooms only to realize that one-third of their time will be spent teaching composition. They have not had any formal training in composition since their freshman year in college, when they were taught by first-year teaching assistants who had not had any formal

[1] "English Teacher Preparation Study: Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English," *English Journal*, 56 (September 1967), 884-895.

[2] *The Adventurer*, No. 85 (Tuesday, August 28, 1753).

training in composition since they were freshmen in college when they were taught by first-year teaching assistants who—

One effective instrument for communicating to our students what the profession is and for encouraging interest in the teaching of English is an active junior affiliate of the NCTE. Every institution that trains English teachers should have an affiliate. It serves to bring together those students considering a career in English. They subscribe to NCTE journals (at a reduced rate); they find out about the profession they are training themselves for before they begin student teaching; they grow in their sense of what the profession is, what it has stood for, what it is striving for. The faculty member who advises or moderates this group should be chosen wisely. It is difficult to imagine a more important appointment for a chairman than the moderatorship of such an affiliate. The moderator must be convinced of the value of such work and be willing to spend time with the students. (Such a responsibility should be taken into account in the measurement of a teacher's load of work.)

It may well be that this moderator will be the best person to apply the first guideline: "The teacher of English at any level should have personal qualities which will contribute to his success as a classroom teacher and should have a broad background in the liberal arts and sciences."

Each college, then, should have an NCTE junior affiliate. From their association with the affiliate our students will grow in their commitment to the profession.

This commitment to the profession includes the teacher's commitment to his students. We read and hear that one should start his teaching with a respect for the student as he is—with an effort, for example, to accept his dialect as part of his identity and to proceed from there, not with an attempt to stamp out his dialect. But won't the fledgling school teacher have trouble developing and communicating this attitude unless he has experienced it in his college training? Our college teachers should examine their behavior here, should ask themselves how they respond to their students' efforts. We have all learned, I suppose, that the first grader needs praise before and after our suggestions for improvement if improvement is to come. We need reminding that the fourteenth grader probably needs more praise if we expect him to respond to our proposals for improving his writing or speaking.

Another commonplace—but one that must not be omitted here lest the prominence it deserves be lessened—is the need for continued and improved cooperation between English and education departments. I gather that we have made real progress here, but at most institutions much improvement can still be made. Three important steps occur to me: getting some of our regular English department members to take over certain classes in the methods course from time to time; having some of these members observe and then confer with our student teachers; and appointing people from education to appropriate committees—working, not paper, committees—in the English department. Wouldn't these steps be forward steps at many institutions?

If, as we consider the Guidelines, we are going to respond to and accept in any way the Dartmouth conference, we will have to bear in mind its findings as

we form our programs and—importantly—as we implement them. As I read Herbert Muller's report on the conference (*The Uses of English*), the most important single idea of that month-long seminar was the need for a proper balance between concentration on the subject matter of English and on the students whose minds have been entrusted to us. English is *not* literature, language, and composition. English is *not* a laboratory in which a student experiences life. English is a difficult-to-arrive-at balance between subject matter and student. English is not merely an analysis of how Polonius' advice to Laertes ("This above all: to thine own self be true,/And it must follow, as the night the day,/Thou canst not then be false to any man") functions in terms of plot, character, and theme in *Hamlet*. English is not merely a discussion, written or oral, about what I as a sixteen-year-old think about truth and self and my relationships to other sixteen-year-olds. English must combine these two: how does the play mean, and what does it mean to *me*. We must not lose sight of the play (small danger in our college English departments); we must make room for the *me*.

I mentioned earlier that we must bear in mind the importance of the Dartmouth conference as we form our programs and as we implement them. Formulating the program is one thing; implementing it is another. If we are convinced that student involvement is important, we must be prepared to listen to students talk—not without guiding them, certainly, but not with such rigid command of the situation that they will soon give up. Telling them on the first day of class that we want them to talk about the course readings won't work; they won't believe us. John M. Kean recently asserted (*Educational Leadership*, April 1967) that 70 percent of the talk going on in schools is teacher talk. Mathematically, each student ends up with 1 percent. No, we have to show our students that we want them to participate; we have to coax them along. Another example: If we are convinced that using class time to discuss student writing—both during the process of composing and after the fact—is important, we must demonstrate this conviction by using class time to discuss student writing. I have never known an English teacher who spent enough class time discussing student writing—and I have known a lot of English teachers. Finally, if we believe that there is room in our literature classes, e.g., the senior class in modern poetry, for a glance at the student's future labors, we should include as one assignment (optional if not required) a paper on how to teach a selected Frost poem to eighth graders. Such an assignment, properly constructed, does not debase the modern poetry course; and no one wants the whole course to be concerned with how to teach modern poetry.

When we think about implementing guidelines, it is inevitable that we are very soon talking about courses. By and large we need not worry about courses in literature. College professors are anxious to teach them; students are anxious to take them; and prospective teachers are looking forward to teaching literature in America's schools. Three important areas remain: language, writing, and methods.

What should be done in the methods course is always a problem. In a sense the best answer is "Everything." But perhaps even more important than the syllabus of the methods course is the dissemination of that syllabus. In all too

many colleges and universities across the land the teachers of English courses do not know what takes place in the methods course—and some of them, sad to relate, do not care. Each English department should take the steps necessary to communicate to all who teach prospective English teachers what the methods course does; all English teachers will then know what topics their students will be attending to in the methods course.

One effort that all of us can engage in is enriching the methods course by the use of consultants. We cannot do everything that the Guidelines recommend, but we must do everything we can to make our prospective teachers aware of all the disciplines involved in the teaching of English. Why not, then, make the methods course a staff effort and ask for help from our authorities in the psychology of learning, the teaching of reading, and the sociology of the city? I am assuming here that we are always striving to involve members of the English department in the methods course—not so much because the education department methods teacher couldn't do as good a job on ways of approaching short fiction, but because English department members should be involving themselves in this aspect of the profession. Again, a planned team effort is superior to an approach to all of these problems from the viewpoint of one person.

But what of writing? There are three methods of implementing those guidelines that deal with writing. The first one—not the best one, certainly, but one worthy of consideration—applies in those colleges that have a one-year sequence in composition, what is usually called freshman composition. Isn't it axiomatic that the future teacher would be helped by not taking the second course (under the semester plan) until his junior year, when he is closer to the classroom where he will teach? His sense of the profession has improved, as has his knowledge of language and literature. The reports that I have from schools following such a program indicate that it works well.

A second way of improving student writing as it relates to teaching is to weave appropriate writing assignments into standard literature courses. Although one would not want to build all his assignments in a Victorian literature course around the possibility—even the probability—that the student will be teaching high school English some day, there is no reason why one essay assignment out of four could not focus on how a Browning monologue should be taught to tenth graders.

But I really don't believe that this second proposal will work very effectively. In the first place the teacher of the advanced literature courses has other important things to do as he teaches literature to twenty-one-year-olds without getting involved with how the work affects fifteen-year-olds. And if he does a good job with the twenty-one-year-olds, they acquire a solid base on which to build. In the second place the teacher of advanced literature courses is often not temperamentally inclined to concern himself with younger people, or even with writing in the sense that we mean it here.

The third way of improving a student's writing—by far the best way, in my opinion—is a year-long course in composition at the junior or senior level. To those who object to this project, who wish the major to be in literature, who say that the English major should study literature in the classroom and write on

the side, I can only cite all of the modern writers who tell us what hard work writing is, what great discipline is needed. (Parenthetically, although I like Edward Albee's story that he writes every day until he gets a headache, my favorite is Flannery O'Connor's. She used to put her feet in a pan of water and make sure that there was no towel near by. Then when the temptation to stop writing came upon her, the difficulty of getting the towel without marring the rug was so great that she stayed at her task.) The chief premise of this year's course would be a conclusion of the Dartmouth conference: that the most important thing about a student's essay is not its need of mechanical improvement but its worthiness of being replied to—by fellow students as well as by teachers. To this end there would be a good deal of "publishing" done, the basic readership being the members of the class. The development of the concept of audience is an important by-product here. The course would have four sections, the most desirable length of each to be determined by experience. Three of these sections would deal with drama, fiction, and poetry; the focus would be on practical criticism with a view to improving the student's ability to discuss the works in oral as well as written form. In writing about literature we enrich the involvement that begins with our reading it. The fourth would deal with writing expository and argumentative prose. Here the student would come to a better understanding of the principles of rhetoric and how they are taught.

We must also squeeze in some place, perhaps in this writing course, the opportunity for the student to write a story or a poem. For, as John Dixon's *Growth through English* reminds us, "Teachers without this experience—who would never think of writing a poem, flinch at the idea of 'acting,' and rarely enter into discussion of the profounder human issues in everyday experience—are themselves deprived and are likely in turn to limit the experience of their pupils."[3]

We should not, I must note, be discouraged by how much remains to be done, for we are making significant progress. The forthcoming Wilcox study of undergraduate English programs indicates that, whereas in 1960 41 percent of the teacher preparation programs required a course in advanced composition, in 1967 55 percent had this requirement. An even more dramatic increase has occurred in linguistics, where the percentage of institutions requiring such course work has jumped from 36 to 60 percent.[4]

Let us turn briefly to the need for improved training in the English language. This is a particularly crucial area for elementary school teachers, it seems to me, because someone is crushing the young child's joy in the language, his delight in puns, his wonder over words—and I'm afraid it's probably the teachers. The teachers who do not respect the identity of the child's dialect because they have had little or no education in the nature of dialects. The teachers who even after *Webster III* and the *Random House Dictionary* insist that *roof* has only one pronunciation, /ruf/ (u as in *goose*), that /rʊf/ (ʊ as in *put*) is substandard. The teachers who still labor to distinguish between *shall* and *will* and who still

---

[3] John Dixon, *Growth through English* (Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967), p. 107.

[4] *Council-Grams*, 40 (January 1968), 11.

inveigh against ending a sentence with a preposition. And why shouldn't they? Until recently we have done little or nothing in college English departments to train prospective teachers in the language.

Here we also need a year-long course, one with perhaps five parts: the nature of language, the history of English, structural grammar, generative-transformational grammar, and matters related to dialects, dictionaries, and usage. And here we can also implement the concept that learning is a process of inquiry and discovery and its corollary that courses or lessons must be constructed to further this process (Guideline VI). Although other subject matters can be approached in a manner that encourages inquiry and discovery, language—because it has been so widely disregarded—is a very good subject for promoting inductive learning. Let me illustrate with three examples: (1) After the student has read material on how our speech is influenced by such forces as family, geography, schooling, and economic status, he can be asked to review his own experience and to write on the way these causes influenced his speech. (2) He can be asked to check in several dictionaries a list of terms and to write a report on the ways in which status labels are used and the impact of his findings on his view of the function of a dictionary. (3) He can be asked to write an essay on, say, Addison's style. In all likelihood he has had little experience in the analysis of prose—beyond perhaps the acquisition of a few presumably useful terms like *spare, sublime, impassioned,* and *dyspeptic.* Now he can be directed to consider such matters as these: (1) sentence length and the ways in which sentences of various lengths are distributed; (2) the extent to which Addison adheres to normal sentence patterns, what patterns are most common, and what transformations are called into play; (3) the kinds of sentence modifiers used and their location; (4) the brevity or expansiveness of nominal elements; (5) the kinds of connectives used. Such an assignment, useful in itself, becomes more interesting when a similar analysis is made of a more contemporary writer and the results of the two analyses are compared. The student can also be invited to analyze his own style. In such a language course he can experience inductive learning.

We have proved that an important message plus the determination to deliver it can result in the message getting through. At the first meeting of the CEE, which took place in 1963 at Indiana University, there were relatively few people from English departments present. In 1968, a great many more English departments were there—speaking, listening, getting ready to bring back the word to their departments.

The program for training teachers of English can be what the members of the profession want it to be—if the members of the profession are willing to work to have their convictions prevail. Peter Schrag's *Voices in the Classroom: Public Schools and Public Attitudes* reminds us that the schools of a community are what the power structure of that community wants them to be. Should not the nation's programs for training English teachers reflect the ETPS Guidelines? Should not these programs reflect our wishes?

Toward a Research Conscience in the Small College Methods Course

DONALD D. SMALL, *University of Toledo*

The many hundred small colleges which prepare English teachers are coming to realize a tremendous opportunity to develop within the methods course what might be called a *research conscience.* Akin to the surgical conscience of the nurse who knows she must replace an accidentally contaminated instrument prior to surgery, the research conscience prevents the contamination of methods students with classroom procedures not validated by research.

We recognize that the small college formerly was usually limited to a general methods course and as a result had no precedent standards for special methods courses in English. Yet this may have been an advantage, for these schools now have a chance to provide methods in English according to less ossified patterns of teacher preparation than might be the case with a larger institution. For example, the small college currently developing a special methods course in English has a clear mandate to fulfill the new ETPS Guidelines published in September 1967.[1]

But what do we know of the English methods course now operating in the small college? A recent research study by this writer made an analysis of such course content in twenty-seven institutions of varying sizes, using an interview instrument validated by seventeen nationally recognized English education specialists.[2] Among the findings on the methods course were many items of interest to the small college. For the purposes of the study, the small college was defined as a school preparing no more than one hundred secondary teachers per year. Twenty-two of the twenty-seven schools were so classified.

Upon completion of the study, there emerged a pattern of suggested content emphasizing a research orientation appropriate to the questioning, probing student who becomes today's secondary English teacher. The findings of the study are listed in appropriate places in the suggested content pattern that follows. The seventeen English education specialists mentioned earlier generally agreed that the content aspect of the course be divided into two areas: content *per se*, and the professional preparation of the instructor. Both, they felt, were of equal importance. The following, then, are the considerations listed by the specialists which emerged as applicable to a methods course in the small college.

---

[1] "English Teacher Preparation Study: Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English," *English Journal,* 56 (September 1967), 884-895.

[2] Donald D. Small, "An Analysis of the Content of Twenty-seven English Methods Courses in Selected Indiana Colleges and Universities," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.

A History of English Methods. The often ill-conceived views a prospective teacher brings to the methods course might well be overcome by a comparison-definition of "old" and "new" method. The valid criticisms of former methods approaches as a veneer of techniques bordering on trivia ought to be frankly analyzed. The examination of new method theory based on a concept of unifying content and process—that one cannot be considered in the absence of the other, that the two are somehow unified—needs to be present early in the course.[3]

Within this historical background enters the research conscience development indicated earlier. Certain practices in the English classroom are based more on a mythology than on knowledge; methods instructors should make the student aware of where these myths lie. According to research findings, we may not assume the student knows (1) that the former faculty-psychology theory of grammar disciplining the mind is a quaint theory; (2) that emphasis on quantity of writing—"a theme a week"—is now regarded as questionable practice; (3) that research has proven sentence diagraming is an unsupported type of verbal Tinkertoys; and (4) that the study of grammar and grammatical terms will not assist students in becoming better writers. In short, we want our student to have a defensible research conscience in English education. If he can develop one, he will stave off becoming an object of quaintness in his years of teaching, tolerated because of a pleasant manner. Friendliness, that old stock-in-trade, lacking the marriage-partner of Competence, produces no academic offspring.

A Perspective on Grammars. It is not enough for the prospective English teacher to "take a stand" on one type of grammar theory or another as was found to be the case in many methods courses. Any teacher who considers himself a generative grammar teacher, a traditional grammar teacher, or a structural linguistics grammar teacher needs to understand the concept relationship of grammars to English teaching. In the small college especially, we need to develop English teachers who are competent, not only in the use of traditional grammars, but also in structural linguistics and generative grammars. Considering the increasing stringency in accreditation, any teacher who is unable to operate in all three grammar areas might shortly be consigned to teaching only in miasmic Dens of Antiquity.

It would be profitable for prospective English teachers to have some familiarity with certain key research findings in grammar. They perhaps ought to know that in 1938 Frogner[4] found that the "thought method" of teaching sentence structure was far more valid than a "grammatical term" orientation, and that in 1955 Strom[5] found no correlation between a student's ability to parse sentences and his ability to write well. In addition, prospective English teachers ought

---

[3] William H. Evans and Jerry L. Walker, *New Trends in the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966), provide a concise perspective on old and new method.

[4] Ellen Frogner, "Grammar Approach vs. Thought Approach in Teaching Sentence Structure," *English Journal,* 28 (September 1939), 519-526; 29 (October 1940), 653-655.

[5] Ingrid M. Strom, "Does Knowledge of Grammar Improve Reading?" *English Journal,* 45 (March 1956), 129-133.

to know that the burgeoning science of psycholinguistics might well become a part of their continuing education in English. Findings in the content of the methods course indicated to the writer a near total absence of such a research orientation in grammar.

An Awareness of Oral Composition. One of the most neglected areas in the methods courses studied was that of oral composition. The prospective English teacher might need to know that his students' actual usage patterns in English are based primarily on oral patterns and not on written patterns; hence, the use of workbooks and other written exercises, while they may provide one attack to the problem, often bypass the major issue of oral composition. Problems of sociolinguistics and dialect study, so prevalent in an increasingly mobile society, need mention in the methods class as a vital part of a teacher's role. Oral composition was understood by nearly all small college methods teachers to be confined to formal classroom exercises in speech-making and interpretation.[6]

A Discovery of Listening Skills. Prospective English teachers were seldom found to have been provided with such background research indexes as Flanders' Interaction Analysis or Ewing's Listening Index, which help to clinically analyze the actual classroom situation. These were not part of the small college course except in a few instances. Practice might be provided in such techniques as oral concert drill as well. Further, skillful use of listening tapes, now available for the secondary classroom, needs to be included as a part of the course to emphasize the growing role listening plays in the classroom.

An Examination of Written Composition. Prospective English teachers appear confused about the concept of a theme a week advocated years ago by Conant, which was meant to be combined with a maximum class load of one hundred students. Questions of frequency and approach in composition writing are not clearly outlined in many methods courses. Concepts of rhetoric such as *inventio, dispositio,* and *elocutio* need to be discussed as a legitimate part of English education. In the methods class the prospective teacher might well plan a sequential writing program in lieu of some of the many lesson plans usually prepared.

We need to show our young teacher that certain aspects of written composition have been examined very closely in recent research. The prospective English teacher should know, for example, exact reasons why we no longer mark compositions with *sp, awk,* and *gr* but rather write more detailed comments for the students. Seldom was such found to be a part of the methods course. Our student should learn in his methods class that one of the major factors in improving student writing is not grammatical ability but the factor of reading ability. We know now what we did not know before: an increase in reading interest and ability level is somehow related to a corresponding increase in writing interest and ability level.

A Rationale for Reading. The implications for the growing importance of

---

[6] Small, *op. cit.,* p. 204.

reading in the English classroom should be made clear to the methods student, especially since there is seldom a course in reading methods available in the small college. The above-mentioned correlation of reading and writing improvement cannot be stressed too strongly. However, the prospective English teacher should also know his limitations. He should know that he is not a reading teacher, and that to be one requires special skills. A reading specialist is not created by handing an English teacher a reading kit.

An Expansion in the Boundaries of Literature. The prospective teacher of English needs to do more than analyze various literature texts as a methods course assignment. He should become aware of the dangers involved in adopting the concept of "coverage" with anthologies, for example. And transitional literatures and other literatures especially appropriate to the junior high or middle school level ought to be presented to him if this is not done elsewhere. This does not prove the course a catchall in any sense. Research on paperbacks such as that recently done by Fader[7] might be discussed in detail in the English methods course. Our methods student needs to know, for example, that pride of ownership appears as one of the major factors in the student interest in paperback literature.

Considering the current deluge of books and materials, the prospective English teacher must be prepared to deal professionally with those who would attempt an illicit control of student reading. Methods instructors in English have a massive obligation to provide prospective teachers with the means for combating forms of censorship by pressure groups or by individuals who would usurp professional selection of student reading. This obligation was found to be only partly met in the courses analyzed. Considering the wealth of literature that students will read, our methods students can no longer dare to go into the English classroom completely unaware of this professional problem. Specific channels of communication with professional organizations need to be outlined for novice teachers beyond the handing out of various publications such as *The Students' Right to Read.*

A Diagnosis of Professional Growth. The English methods instructor might provide his students with certain criteria for selecting those schools and English departments in which he can establish a professionally growing career. This is especially true if no capstone course follows the student teaching experience. In addition, the methods instructor might suggest initial membership in the National Council of Teachers of English and the appropriate state council of teachers of English. Only on occasion did we find a methods instructor who *required* this of his students. The many graduate fields within English education and those schools which have appropriate graduate programs might be discussed as well.

As a further condition of the English teacher's professional growth, the "new English" methods course provides some information on the new militancy of teacher organizations. The naivete of the prospective teacher should be disturbed

---

[7] Daniel Fader, *Hooked on Books* (New York: Berkley Publishing Corp., 1966).

by specific assignments in reading about the situations in which the NEA and the AFT often assist in creating professional growth opportunities. We can no longer ignore, in the name of English specialization, either of these organizations; the professional English teacher is going to be inextricably involved in them during his career.

The Instructor Background Criteria. While the prior considerations were focused on the content of the methods course, it was obvious to the seventeen English education specialists involved in the study that as a basic requirement the instructor of the English methods course would need to have many years of successful teaching in the secondary English classroom, preferably at a wide variety of levels and in different types of schools. In addition, the methods course instructor must himself have a sound research conscience. Too often instructors relied on their own dated experiences in secondary teaching at the expense of current findings.

The professional competence of the methods course instructor includes a continuing contact with the secondary schools. It was found this was not the case in over fifty percent of the courses. The instructor needs direct contact with secondary schools. Certainly his methods students need opportunities to make observations in the secondary schools.

Yet a certain caution is necessary. If the prospective English teacher makes an observation, he should see examples of excellence in research-based teaching. Observations of dated procedures such as sentence parsing are a disservice. If need be, videotape facilities should be provided so prospective English teachers can see examples of teaching excellence in all of the above-mentioned areas involved in English education. Several instances of videotape procedures were found in some of the smallest schools, thus apparently refuting the argument of expense.

According to the research study, one of the students' major criticisms of the English methods course is that there is often no relationship between the lesson and unit planning done for the course and the activities found in the student teaching sequence; methods instructors need to insure that the materials which students prepare for the methods course can be flexible enough for use in student teaching as well.

Continuing Growth in Competence. A final item in the professional competence of the methods instructor can be labeled as the need for providing for continuing professional growth. The methods course instructor in English should expand his memberships beyond the discipline of English to supervision and research organizations, especially in the area of educational change. All too few methods instructors can identify the regional educational laboratory operating in their area or indicate appropriate ERIC centers. All too few seem to know of the trend to statewide method instructor organizations. Illinois, Indiana, and New York have recently organized statewide groups of English methods course instructors to discuss common problems and approaches to English education.

A key action of the Conference on English Education recently established a Committee on Ends and Means in the Methods Course, which it is hoped will

coordinate and stimulate research efforts in the content of the methods course. The committee may assist methods instructors in locating the dimensions of their courses.

If we maintain the overview which the above findings provoke, we may then look upon a methods course far distant from the one that taught students to keep chalk trays clean and to erase with vertical strokes. If the preparation of English teachers is to grow tall and true, one of the major stimuli will be the restructure of the methods course in the small college to promote the research conscience, for we become more aware every day that the traditional teacher of English is a contradiction in terms.

Literary Critical Theory and the English Education Specialist

ALAN L. MADSEN, *University of Illinois*

I must start with a disclaimer. I am not a specialist in literary critical theory. I am, however, interested in it, have dabbled in it enough to have developed an instrument to test what undergraduates in teacher training programs know about it. This seems to have been enough, not to *qualify* me to submit this paper, but enough to have gotten me an invitation to submit it. Therefore, if much of what I have to say seems elementary and obvious to you, I apologize for it, but I myself am just discovering what may already be obvious to you.

Perhaps the first thing to acknowledge is that there is no such thing as A critical theory. There are *theories,* all of which in some way or other contradict each other. No two critics even within the same school agree in all detail with each other. Within the group commonly classified as New Critics, T. S. Eliot disagrees with I. A. Richards about the nature of the creative act. John Crowe Ransom disagrees with Cleanth Brooks about the "structure" of a poem. René Wellek and Austin Warren disagree with I. A. Richards about the "mode of existence" of a work of art. And they all would disagree with Northrop Frye who, in his *Anatomy of Criticism,* relegates New Criticism, as W. K. Wimsatt puts it, to the "wintry cellar" of criticism.

If one were so inclined, one could easily despair of what some have called "the chaos of criticism" in our time, since theoretical critics do not seem even to agree on what the word criticism means—much less words like genre, form, structure, and the like. So each creates his own private lexicon; each builds his own special system. There are biographical critics and psychological critics and typological critics and textual critics and mythological critics. You name it; it probably exists.

It was surely this sense of disorder which prompted Northrop Frye to construct his *Anatomy* on the assumption—or perhaps the pious hope—that criticism is a science and, as a science, consists of an organized body of knowledge whose principles, though not entirely known at present, once elucidated would form a coherent and comprehensive theory of literature, uniting what appear to be the most disparate of critical theories and practices.[1]

We all like a tidy universe. We would all like to have an established authority in criticism. But I think it is highly unlikely that we will get one for some time. And because we have no such center we will continue to have among us the town criers who periodically announce the ruin of Pompeii. Destruction

[1] Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (New York: Atheneum, 1966), p. 11.

was proclaimed with the advent of theories of structural and transformational grammars, but we have learned to live with them—even to profit from them. And this brings me to a second point.

Rightly or wrongly, like it or not, critical theories have influenced our teaching of literature in the secondary schools ever since English has been a bona fide subject in the curriculum, and they will continue to do so in the future. It would not be difficult, I think, to document the relationship of moralistic criticism (later to be known as the New Humanism) to practices in the secondary school just before and after the turn of the century. The identification of the study of literature with a cultural and social elite, with the development of intellectual and moral leadership is surely evident in the continuing recommendations by the Committees on Uniform College Entrance Requirements of that period: All secondary school youth should read *Silas Marner, Ivanhoe, Julius Caesar* . . . you can supply the rest.

Of course, the moral approach to literature was an ancient and most honored one even before there was such a thing as secondary school English. Moral interests are so basic to man that it should not surprise us that the concept of literature as a criticism of life, as a record of the "best that has been thought and said," should be such a mainstay of secondary school programs in the twentieth century.

The questions of literature's ability to make propositional statements, to yield truths, to inspire belief became central issues of the New Criticism. They became issues because of a need by these critics to take literature out of competition with philosophy, science, history, and ethics. The issue became one of justifying poetry, as Murray Krieger puts it, "by securing for it a unique function for which modern scientism cannot find a surrogate."[2]

We all now know the direction that this justification took: an attempt to find a unique function for poetry through an aesthetics of autonomy. With it came T. S. Eliot's "objective correlative" and W. K. Wimsatt's "intentional" and "affective" fallacies. "Aesthetic distance" and "complexity" became criteria for good poetry. For a while one dared not open his mouth about literature for fear of being cast into hell for committing "the heresy of paraphrase."

New Criticism or formalism, as it is sometimes called, made substantial contributions to our understanding of the intrinsic qualities of literature, and I wish to return to these later. I only wish to point out here that the New Critics were not altogether successful in establishing an objective theory of aesthetic value for literature, and that we now seem to be witnessing the birth of another New Humanism, not altogether unlike what reached a peak of emphasis in the thirties in this country. The instituting of high school courses in the humanities, the recent establishment of a national endowment for the humanities, the demand from some quarters that the NCTE sponsor bigger and better humanities conferences—all suggest a return to considerations of moral value, to literature's content value.

---

[2]Murray Krieger, *The New Apologists for Poetry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963), p. 6.

In a paper read at the NCTE meeting in Honolulu last year, Maxine Greene noted that "the shift has already begun." She illustrated by referring to an article in *College English* by H. V. S. Ogden, about which Miss Greene said, "He assumes that the study of literature is carried on mainly as a means to the end of 'intellectual, emotional, and moral development of the individual mind.' From an explicitly humanist vantage point, he asserts that 'only a narrow and technical kind of knowledge' can be gained through study of works of literature perceived as 'constructs integrated into self-contained wholes.'"[3]

Miss Greene went on to say that the value plight of the younger generation and our cultural situation at large promote an approach to art that will justify its study for its intellectual and moral values. But she also warned that such an approach represents a return to extrinsic considerations and that the "specter of didacticism lurks behind it" and "threatens once again . . . the integrity of literary art forms."[4]

This same issue emerges in a monograph titled *Friends to This Ground*—a recent assessment by the NCTE's Commission on Literature on "the particular values in literature and . . . its place in the current swirl of adjustments in education . . ."[5] After identifying some of the various—and seemingly conflicting—claims made for the study of literature, William Stafford writes:

> Teachers of English live amidst these arguments and often find it enticing to claim many distinctive values for literature; but when there is need to justify their work in the face of aggressive claims from other subjects, it is tempting to slight the intricate and tentative appeals of art. . . . Anxious to validate our subject, we have claimed for it a place among the exacting studies presumably stabilized in a realm more secure than the human. But we may have to accept the idea that the human experiences that get play in literature provide its only validation. At this stage of discussion among members of our profession, it is probably impossible to sort out the strands of our confusion.[6]

I think it is possible to sort out some of the strands of our confusion, and this, then, becomes point three: part of our confusion is owing to our willingness to be persuaded by literary critics and educators alike that human experience—the source of validation for literature—must be defined in accordance with some one particular system for examining art's values.

In our willingness to find, once and for all, some justification for literature, we are often tempted to retreat into that blind alley of the dichotomy of form and content. We feel pressed to choose either/or. We somehow believe we cannot choose both/and. But we can, indeed, choose both/and if we are willing to maintain that literature's formal properties are part of the "human experience" of art, too. Surely this is what the past forty years of New Criticism has been about.

But it may have been the New Criticism that a parent had rather bitterly in mind when he said to me recently: "If you guys should decide to teach sex in

---

[3] Maxine Greene, "Aesthetics, Criticism, and the Work of Literary Art," unpublished paper read at the NCTE National Convention, Honolulu, Hawaii, November 1967, pp. 5-6.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[5] William Stafford, *Friends to This Ground* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967), p. vi.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 17, 19.

the schools and if you do it the way you teach English, within five years you'll have a foolproof method of birth control. There just won't be any interest in sex any more."

To be sure, the New Criticism is in part responsible for our nonhumanizing approaches to literature; but, like the ancient dualism of form and content, the New Criticism reached a theoretical dead end. It has never been able to solve the problem of how poetry, as a totally unique and autonomous verbal construction, can be both referential and nonreferential. Our concern with its referential character, with what we usually call its "content," should not make us retreat, however, to the view that literature consists of some content—economic, political, ethical—which is embellished and ornamented like a birthday cake. New Criticism, if it has done anything, has shown us the integral relationships between form and content. It has given to us some indispensable concepts for examining literature: tone, point of view, symbolism, texture, irony, and the like.

And, after all, what are theories for if not to provide hypotheses, to map out a terrain, and to establish methods of inquiry? Theoretical systems are constructs which allow the critic to investigate some aspect of literature and to pass along those insights that are yielded up. We need not accept as final a definition of literature or a statement of its unique value that may accompany some one system. In fact, no one theory fully accounts for literature and our experiences with it.

But, of course, it is not sufficient for us merely to recognize that there exists a plurality of valid kinds of criticism, each of which employs some special methodology. We must know the theories and methods well enough to use them in our training of English teachers and in our own research. It is to these last two points that I wish to devote the remainder of my paper.

First, the problem of using criticism in the training of teachers. In a methods course we are always concerned with an ends-means relationship, and we want our potential English teachers to be so concerned. One way we can do this is by showing how, at the outset of any class discussion of literature, the kinds of questions asked limit and define what is to be, or what can be, known about the literature under discussion. And further, these questions automatically imply some conception of literature and its values which teachers, by the very nature of the teaching-learning process, pass along to their students.

I can remember all too vividly an undergraduate course in Shakespeare where the professor gave to us elaborate statements by D. A. Traversi, Ernest Jones, and Edmund Wilson about what *Hamlet* "means." Of course, the professor never bothered to tell us how these critics arrived where they did, what assumptions they made, what aspect of the work they were especially concerned with. I left the course hopelessly confused and joined the vast numbers of students who regard interpreting literature as a task second only to explaining the Immaculate Conception.

If we ask questions exclusively about the interrelationships of the language system, how these operate to produce form and meaning *sui generis*, we are employing some variety of New Criticism. If, on the other hand, we ask

questions about the work's effect on us in comparison to the effect produced by other works of the same kind—not on the basis of the language system, but on the basis of the action that the work imitates—we are probably employing a typological or genre criticism. If we ask questions about the cultural patterns, specific and universal, which are reflected in a work through its recurrent images, we are using an archetypal criticism to derive form and meaning.

Of course, the foregoing statements are gross simplifications of what any one system entails, but they do illustrate what I believe to be the essential rightness of Frye's statement that we do not teach literature directly, only criticism of it, since response to literature is always to some extent personal and private. We may not ever fully and finally answer the persistent question that students ask: "Why study literature?" But criticism may help us enlarge the context in which a satisfying answer may be found.

Our unique responsibility, as methods teachers, should be with showing those teachers-to-be how they can use criticism to make the manifold values of literature accessible to youth. They do this not by subjecting their students to elaborate critical systems and not by slinging its jargon. Rather, they use criticism first, to supply consistent contexts in which discussions of meaning and value may occur; second, to help change wayward and haphazard responses to literature into more systematic and informed ones; and third, to develop classroom strategies for bringing students and literature together.

Let me illustrate this last point by calling your attention to an article which appeared in the *English Journal* a couple of years ago. The article, by Ben Nelms, is called "Reading for Pleasure in Junior High School."[7] In it, Nelms argues for a legitimate place for the adolescent novel in junior high schools. He further argues that since the same structural patterns and thematic content are present in these more popular novels as are present in those qualitatively superior books that we teach in the classroom, why not use this knowledge to make a connection between the reading that goes on outside of the classroom with the reading that goes on inside? Clearly, Nelms has taken one of the major concepts in Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* and applied it to the end of reducing what I believe is the "credibility gap" that secondary school youth sense in English classrooms.

Does our using criticism in this fashion mean the surrender of critical standards? Yes, I suppose it does if what is meant by "critical standard" is some absolute and unchanging value that must accompany experience with particular works of literature. Literature itself changes as the context in which it is read and discussed changes. Recognition of that fact should help our teachers avoid playing with their students that silly game called "rank the poets." Even if you are convinced that your judgment is right and true, and most of us do believe that, Frye points out that as a tactical maneuver it makes little sense to tell students that their judgment is in error. Better that we help them recognize the reasons for which they presently value.

---

[7]Ben Nelms, "Reading for Pleasure in Junior High School," *English Journal*, 55 (December 1966).

Another question. Does this mean that we must endorse eclecticism? Yes it does, though I prefer the term "perspectivism" since it implies a knowing and systematic choice rather than a random flitting from one framework to another. I submit that our considerations must be wholly pragmatic. For example, I have often thought that Frye's principles could be employed with culturally disadvantaged youth to effect a union between "subcultural" experiences and what we like to think of as the mainstream of cultural experiences. At least it is a hypothesis to test. And it is on that note that I wish to turn, finally, to the continuing and reciprocal relationship between critical theory and empirical research.

We are perhaps unaware that a singular event occurred in critical theory in the 1920's. That event was the wedding of critical theory (or aesthetics) with psychology in the criticism of I. A. Richards, and to it we owe much of what little knowledge we presently have about response to literature. Richards' attempt to develop a theory of criticism which rested on an account of value and an account of communication led him away from traditional aesthetics to a theory grounded in experimental psychology.

In *Principles of Literary Criticism,* Richards objects to the idea so long held in traditional aesthetics that the experience of art is *sui generis* because this conception leads one to view the "arts as providing a private heaven for aesthetes" and to a consequent impediment to the investigation of the value of the arts.[8]

Richards tried to locate aesthetic value in the experience of the reader, and he described that value in psychological terms as the efficient organization of impulses and attitudes, a "finer organization of *ordinary*" (italics mine), not *different,* experiences.[9]

Not only did his theory provide a way to make the experience of literature available to the many instead of the few (like Northrop Frye's in our own time), but it led him to his famous "protocol" method for identifying and examining sources of difficulty in apprehending and interpreting literature.

Though we may not agree with Richards' notion of what the understanding of a text involves, his method encouraged similar studies for discovering dimensions of response to literature. I wish to mention only two of those studies here, one rather well known, the other not well known but destined to be.

The well-known one is James R. Squire's *The Responses of Adolescents While Reading Four Short Stories.*[10] The significance of Squire's study is that it attempted to record the thought processes involved in responses as they occur, and it employed sophisticated statistical procedures to relate patterns of response to variables such as ability, personality predispositions, sex differences, and the like.

---

[8] I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1925), pp. 17-18.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 16.

[10] James R. Squire, *The Responses of Adolescents While Reading Four Short Stories,* NCTE Research Report No. 2 (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964).

The other study, just published as a part of the NCTE Research Report series, is titled *Elements of Writing about a Literary Work: A Study of Response to Literature* by Alan C. Purves with Victoria Rippere.[11] This truly remarkable piece of research addresses itself to the methodological problem of characterizing the typical patterns of written response to literature by thirteen- and seventeen-year-olds both here and abroad. Purves cuts across the usual categories of criticism—historical, biographical, psychological, etc.—to classify elements of written response into four broad categories: engagement-involvement, perception, interpretation, and evaluation. Any one category contains a number of elements of written response, some of which are undoubtedly learned. For example, the category for perception alone contains no less than fifty-seven separate entries of constituents of written response.

Of course, the identification of a large number of elements of written response is not what makes this report exciting, though, to be sure, the Purves study reminds us again how very complex response can be, even with adolescents. What I find exciting about the report are these possibilities:

1. Not only that we may now be able to perceive with greater clarity the complex nature of response, but that we may be able to describe it with greater precision than we have heretofore. Perhaps this fact alone will help us move away from an outmoded conception of response which makes us talk about "ooh" and "aah" experiences with literature—"ooh" to be identified with emotional response and "aah" to be identified with cognitive response.
2. That we may now begin to talk about response in the more neutral terms that Purves gives us. Maybe one day we can discard terms like "appreciate" and "enjoy" as serving no useful descriptive purpose in research. These have probably served as much to cloak our understanding as to enlighten it.
3. That this report will encourage similar kinds of studies of response to literature, since it provides a broad, workable framework for analyzing expressed response. For example, I should like to see a longitudinal study which tried to establish frequency of kinds of response at different age or grade levels. We might expect that younger readers make more statements about their engagement than they do their perception, though we do not know for sure. Maybe engagement-involvement statements are more numerous when perception is clear. In what ways are perception and interpretation related? Do the kinds of statements made vary with the kind of literature which is studied? With the kind of critical framework used to discuss literature? If readers are left to themselves for long periods of time, as in individualized reading programs, will their written responses tend to exhibit more of one kind of response than another? Are students more evaluative or less under

[11] Alan C. Purves and Victoria Rippere, *Elements of Writing about a Literary Work: A Study of Response to Literature*, NCTE Research Report No. 9 (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968). Mr. Purves was kind enough to let me read his page proofs.

these conditions? Do they make more statements of engagement-involvement or less?

All of these questions plus the ones you have already thought of could provide topics for dissertations for many years to come.

At this point in time it is probably impossible to document the full extent of our indebtedness to the critical work of I. A. Richards; any criticism which concerns itself with spectator response—and not all criticisms do—must have an impact on those of us who are especially interested in the problems of the literary education of the young. For one thing, Richards' joining criticism with psychology probably paved the way for those hundreds of studies we now have on the reading preferences of adolescents. A statement of preference is also a response to literature.

His influence can be seen in the work of people like Lou LaBrant and Louise Rosenblatt, and most especially in Rosenblatt's *Literature as Exploration* (1938) where, in addition to Richards' notion that art provides coherence to experience, one notes also the stress on the highly individual nature of response. Incidentally, *Literature as Exploration* has been reissued this year in paperback (Noble & Noble). Is that another sign of our renewed concern for response to literature?

Perhaps it is some sort of irony that the New Criticism was significantly advanced through the work of Richards even though we in education seem to have profited as much from his critical theory. The New Criticism took his concept of irony and modified his concept of tension, though it could not abide the relativity implied in his definition of aesthetic experience. We took his neurological concept of response and often employed it as a theoretical justification for looking through literature at something else called "needs." There is a moral in this. Ours is a dual responsibility: on the one hand we must know critical theories and practices which focus on the literary object to be perceived; on the other we must be sensitive to the complexity of response and ever alert to how we can use response to create literary meaning and value. We cannot sacrifice one to the other.

A Curriculum Sequence in Modern Grammars for English Teachers

ALFRED L. PAPILLON, *DePaul University*

The field of English education has been vigorously productive of new knowledge since well before the occurrence of Sputnik I. Beginning in the late 1940's, English scholars have started developing modern grammars which consist of new conceptualizations that potentially revolutionize the teaching of grammar in American high schools and colleges. In contrast to the development of new knowledge in other fields, especially in the sciences, these modern grammars evolved as a matter of concern for English scholars and not for teachers of English in the secondary schools. This characteristic of new knowledge in grammar means that the development of modern grammars is evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Also, it means that since the new knowledge is now established, the next phase in the evolution of modern grammars must be the education of teachers of English in modern grammars and the introduction of modern grammars into the curriculum of secondary schools. The present article is limited to one of the problems involved in the education of future teachers of grammar and in the reeducation of those who are already in the field.

All thinking in this area is influenced by the fact that traditional grammar is firmly established in both the teacher education curriculum of higher institutions and in the curriculum of the secondary schools. Hence, in introducing modern grammar into the curriculum for the preparation of English teachers in colleges and universities, several important questions must be considered. Should traditional grammar continue to be taught? How many systems of grammar should English teachers know? In the case of teachers already prepared to teach traditional grammar, what system of grammar should they learn next? In the case of future English teachers, should they first learn a modern grammar and then traditional grammar, or *vice versa*? If all English teachers learn traditional grammar, which of the modern grammars is most appropriate to be learned next? To the first question, existing conditions provide at least a practical answer. Since English teachers in the schools today know mainly traditional grammar and since the curriculum of the secondary schools provides mainly for traditional grammar, it will be necessary to continue teaching traditional grammar to future teachers for some time to come. A reliable answer is provided for the second question by a consensus of opinion of the leadership in English education. The consensus is that a good English teacher in secondary schools should know at least two systems of grammar, and a superior English teacher should have "sufficient knowledge to illustrate richly and specifically the detailed knowledge he has of the two systems."[1]

[1]The Illinois State-wide Curriculum Center for Preparation of Secondary School Teach-

Answers to the three other questions are so far not available, either from practical administrative considerations or from a consensus of authoritative opinions. An element which all three have in common is that they are variations of the basic issue of *sequence* in the study of modern grammars by English teachers. Consequently, an answer to all three of them can be found by establishing some principle for a sequential curriculum in the study of grammars. Accordingly, it is the argument of the present article that such a principle exists in the continuum from deductive to inductive thinking which is inherent in the nature of thinking processes involved in the various grammars. From this viewpoint, the various grammars occupy different positions on the continuum from fully deductive to completely inductive thinking. The principle herein advanced means that an effective curriculum sequence in the study of grammars by English teachers is to begin with the traditional grammar, which is fully deductive in its thinking, and to proceed successively to modern grammars, which are progressively more empirical and more inductive in their thinking.

In order to demonstrate the validity of this principle, it is obviously necessary to describe briefly some of the representative modern grammars. The following paragraphs are an attempt to make such descriptions to the extent that is needed to confirm the hypothesis stated above, but no claim is made that these descriptions constitute an exhaustive analysis of modern grammars.

Traditional grammar basically utilizes deductive thinking processes. It uses meaning as a basis for arriving at classifications and formulas.[2] From these basic conceptualizations, it proceeds to analyze sentences. Traditional grammar approaches "language as a tool of thought."[3] It assumes that "language is a reflection of thought," and that grammar consists of the "laws of language."[4] It is normative and prescriptive in its content, and it legislates how native speakers of English *ought* to use the language.[5] These mental processes in traditional grammar are illustrated by the usual manner of teaching sentences. In the traditional approach to the grammatical analysis of sentences, one first determines the total meaning of the utterance before beginning the analysis, and the subsequent process of analysis "consists almost wholly of giving technical names to portions of this total meaning."[6]

Obviously, the order of thinking in traditional grammar is from the general to the particular, and this grammar occupies a position near the completely deductive pole on the continuum from deductive to inductive thinking.

Transformational grammar employs a greater share of both deductive and inductive thinking. Undoubtedly a most distinctive element of inductive thought inherent in transformational grammar is the unifying of grammatical

---

ers of English, "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," *College English*, 27 (November 1965), 166-169.

[2] W. Nelson Francis, *The Structure of American English* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1958), p. 226.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[4] Cf. Charles Carpenter Fries, *The Structure of English* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1952), p. 18.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

phenomena involving sentences into the concept of the transformation of the kernel sentence, which concept is also applied to changes in words. The attainment of such singleness in explaining cause and effect among phenomena is genuinely scientific thinking; traditional grammar has nothing approaching it. The concept of the transform is a key to such a wide range of grammatical phenomena that it constitutes a structure for English grammar in the terms of the new conceptual theories of curriculum.

On the other hand, in teaching the specifics of grammar involved in the transformations of words, groups of words, and sentences, transformational grammar retains much of the content that is used in traditional grammar. The terminology is predominantly the same. Moreover, the classifications and curricular organization of traditional grammar are found also in transformational grammar. Most importantly from the viewpoint of this article, the basic processes of thought in transformational grammar are largely as deductive as they are in traditional grammar. For instance, from the very outset in a book on sentences, one of the proponents of transformational grammar defines grammar as "a set of rules for making English sentences,"[7] although the distinction must be kept in mind that Roberts would not define "rules" as the traditionalists do. The rules of Roberts are phrase-structure rules and transformational rules, as developed by Chomsky. They are descriptions of the way sentences are put together. Nevertheless, the set-of-rules way of thinking is also utilized in traditional grammar, and it is basically deductive.

It appears clearly, therefore, that some aspects of transformational grammar involve thought processes that are more "scientific" than traditional grammar. Sentence patterns are arrived at mainly by observation and induction in the transformational approach, whereas they are arrived at by logic and intuition in the traditional approach. Transformational grammar "generalizes" grammatical phenomena through use of the concept of the transform, whereas traditional grammar permits them to proliferate as discrete entities. On the whole, however, the gap between these two grammars on the continuum from deductive to inductive thinking is not too great. The size of the gap supports the conclusion that transformational grammar should be established as the sequel to traditional grammar in a curriculum sequence of grammars for English teachers.

Another type of modern grammar is that represented by the work of W. Nelson Francis. This modern grammar is permeated with liberal amounts of phonology and morphology which are intrinsic to the grammatical topics. The linguistic content, however, is not the main determiner of his treatment of grammar. A more significant aspect is his concern with syntactic structure as a key to a science of grammar. Hence, this grammar is referred to by Francis himself as structural grammar.

Characteristic of this modern grammar is its utilization of scientific thought procedures by deliberate design. W. Nelson Francis outlines the scientific thought processes implemented in his study of the science of grammar as at-

---

[7]Paul Roberts, *English Sentences* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962), p. 1.

tention to a coherent body of facts, careful objective descriptions, making generalizations, making predictions, and stating laws. These processes are fully implemented in his work.[8] He progresses from *forms* to *meaning*, and the process includes collecting adequate samples of speech, objective examination and analysis of the samples, arriving at generalizations concerning the devices and patterns of their structure, and stating these generalizations in such forms as rules, lists, charts, or diagrams. This approach "is directly opposite to that of the traditional prescientific grammarian, who used meaning as a basis for his classifications and formulas."[9] Implementing the scientific approach, Francis organizes grammatical phenomena around the single basic concept of *structure*, i.e., "the organizing of morphemes and words into larger meaningful utterances."[10] Further, the phenomena of structural grammar are explained by five conceptualizations: word order, prosody, function words, inflections, and derivational contrast.[11] Thus, the field of grammar is practically unified by a few basic concepts arrived at by scientific thinking.

But, for the further elaboration of grammatical knowledge, Francis reverts extensively to traditional terminology and traditional thought processes. Below the level of classifications and formulas, parts of speech and parts of sentences are presented through the technique of define-elaborate-illustrate as in traditional grammar.

Generally speaking, however, the structural grammar as it is represented by Francis is located further in the direction of the inductive pole than is transformational grammar on the continuum from deductive to inductive thought. Furthermore, the gap along this continuum between the grammars of Francis and Roberts is greater than the gap between Roberts and traditional grammar. Structural grammar of the Francis variety is considerably more inductive than it is deductive.

Finally, there is another variety of structural grammar which is involved wholly with inductive thought processes. Hence, it may be called "inductive" structural grammar to distinguish it from the structural grammar of Francis. Representative of this modern grammar is the work of Charles C. Fries. His concept of grammar is that it "consists of the devices that signal structural meanings—the patterns of form and arrangement of words."[12] Such signals are the structure of language, and grammatical knowledge is organized around this concept of structure.

Using a sample of fifty hours of English speech recorded in a university community, Fries proceeds to a thoroughly empirical description of language phenomena. Parts of speech are organized into four *classes* numbered 1 to 4 and eleven *groups* of words which are lettered A to K. Sentences are classified into patterns of *situation utterances* and *sequence utterances*. *Formulas* utilizing number and letter symbols are developed to express patterns of word orders.

---

[8] Francis, *The Structure of American English*, pp. 15-16.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 226.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 223.
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 229-234.
[12] Fries, *The Structure of English*, p. 56.

The gap between traditional grammar and the grammar of Fries is widened to the extent that quotation marks are used by him whenever traditional terminology is used, such as "subjects" and "objects." It is obvious that inductive structural grammar must be placed near the opposite pole from traditional grammar on the deductive-inductive continuum.

The burden of the previous pages has been to provide evidence that a spectrum from deductive to inductive knowledge already exists in the field of modern grammars. As a corollary, however, the principle of a progression of knowledge between the two poles of intellectual processes has greater generalizability for curriculum theory in higher education. The concept is applicable in all the fields of knowledge. For the fields in the province of the humanities, it is possible to begin at the intuitive end of the thinking processes, with which the humanities are familiar, and lead students through studies in the same field to the inductive end, with which the humanities are not familiar. For the fields of knowledge in the province of the sciences, the progression would occur in the opposite direction. Thus a common factor would be provided for all knowledge by utilizing the range of possible mental processes in each field of knowledge individually. The graduates of such a curriculum would be, on the one hand, humanists who have important competencies of the scientist and, on the other hand, scientists who have important competencies of the humanist. Since the union of mental processes characteristic of both the humanities and the sciences would be accomplished in each of the fields of study, this new type of curriculum could be known as the "intra-disciplinary" curriculum. It would be intra-disciplinary in terms of knowledge as process just as the "inter-disciplinary" curriculum of the past has been inter-disciplinary in terms of knowledge as product.

From several viewpoints, modern grammars are in the mainstream of the contemporary curriculum development movement. Since 1960, curriculum theory has emphasized conceptual learning and has enunciated the companion doctrines of structuring the concepts and identifying the processes of a field of knowledge. Hence, new knowledge in grammar compares favorably with new knowledge in other fields in the light of curriculum theory. Surprisingly enough, this avant-garde quality is not recognized and publicized as much for structures and processes of modern grammar as for other fields in the "curriculum" literature. Whereas recent pedagogical curriculum publications report extensively the developments of structure and process in other disciplines, similar achievements in linguistics remain relatively unpublicized.[13] One has to read the works of the scientific grammarians themselves to realize their significance fully.

Two explanations may account for this discrepancy. The first is historical. Structures and processes evolved in the field of grammar in the late 1940's and 1950's, thus predating the structure and process approach in curriculum theory which appeared only in the early 1960's. Hence, possibly the relevance of the modern grammars to new curriculum theory was obscured. A second

[13] Cf. Phi Delta Kappa, *Education and the Structure of Knowledge*, ed. Stanley Elam, Fifth Annual Phi Delta Kappa Symposium on Educational Research (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964).

explanation may be the lack of concern on the part of linguistic scholars to implement their findings in the curriculum of the secondary schools. Professional curriculum people are especially aware of new knowledge as it affects instruction in the schools, and therefore they may have neglected new knowledge which admittedly was of concern almost exclusively to the profession of English. Whatever the reason may be, the important fact remains that it is now more than time to introduce linguistics into the schools in the form of textbooks and instructional materials. A crash program for producing English linguistic teaching materials similar to the large-scale curriculum projects in the sciences and mathematics is definitely in order.

On the other hand, from the viewpoint of the teachers of English, numerous institutes have already devoted much attention to modern grammars, but several times as many are needed. Since English teachers are the most numerous category of secondary school teachers, the task of preparing them through in-service programs presents a very great challenge.

Important decisions relative to organization and sequence for studying and teaching modern grammars must be made. The present article has advanced and defended one approach in curriculum sequence for teaching modern grammars to English teachers. There are sound reasons for teaching these grammars beginning with transformational grammar, followed by structural, and concluding with inductive structural grammar as those modern grammars are exemplified in the works of Paul Roberts, W. Nelson Francis, and Charles Carpenter Fries respectively. The learning challenge in this grammatical sequence is to master progressively more empirical and inductive methods of thinking. Since English teachers are steeped in the deductive, intuitive processes of traditional grammar, introducing them to modern grammars on a progressively more inductive continuum appears to be the most effective curriculum sequence for ushering them into the new world of scientific grammar.

Language Instruction at the Secondary Level

FRANK J. ZIDONIS, *Ohio State University*

The title of the program for which this paper was prepared, "What Philosophy Should Underlie Language Instruction at the Secondary Level?" can be read in ambiguous ways. It is possible to give a falling intonation pattern to the sentence, stress the modal "should," and thus suggest quite strongly—and, I think, wrongly—that there is a particular philosophy, suited especially to language instruction, that I am in a position to reveal to you. I do not presume to be in such a position, but I do want to share with you the sorts of questions I found myself posing in addressing this topic. It seems to me that what we are discussing here, in fact, is the nature of the role that should be played by the teacher; and to do that, we might first ask what the nature of the English language curriculum should be, and what that of the language learner is.

Now I suppose if the topic "What Is English?" appears once more on a conference program for teachers or is the issue to be discussed in a seminar, symposium, forum, meeting, or kaffee klatsch, hardly any of us would be blamed for choosing the alternative of early retirement from the profession. I do not intend to belabor the English curriculum problem with you, though obviously what we take that curriculum to be affects our design for instruction. Rather I shall try to draw the connections between two kinds of English curriculum envisioned by the profession historically and associate with them the role I see the teacher playing. I shall also speculate in a concluding section on the possible relevance that current transformational study holds for us teachers of English—though perhaps the term generative *semantics* is now more appropriate than generative *grammar*. These associated connections are further complicated by our assessment of how children learn their language. Thus there are three parts, I think, that need to be related in my topic: the curriculum, learning theory, especially vis-à-vis language acquisition, and teaching strategy, that is, how the teacher might combine what he knows about curriculum and language acquisition to make the outcome meaningful for the student. My thesis is that one way to illustrate a specific philosophy of language instruction is through the teacher's conception of what his role is; developing an *ideal* philosophy of language instruction involves the conceptualizing of an *ideal* role for the teacher of English.

I

The two characterizations of curriculum I've chosen for this kind of brief analysis are the language arts program and the equally well-known tripod of language, literature, and composition. First, the language arts curriculum. This is probably best described in the curriculum series prepared by the Commission

on the English Curriculum of the NCTE. Volume III of the series, *The English Language Arts in the Secondary School,* shows what the underlying philosophy of the entire series is by trying to develop competencies in the language arts to meet youth's needs in a "world of change, of speed, of massed groups, of heightened tensions, and of gravely conflicting views . . ."[1] The Commission quite clearly saw a relationship between the social order and the work of the English teacher, as this excerpt illustrates:

> Special emphasis should be given in the program of the language arts to the fact that the locus of every social problem is in an individual personality, striving to find some security within himself through which he may hope to be equal to the conflicting demands of the life about him. Later chapters in this volume will illustrate from the classrooms of the country what the teaching of literature and of imaginative expression in both speech and writing can do to foster this security and the individuality of which it is a part. These chapters demonstrate also that the problems of communication, both intimately personal and set in the framework of social conflict, are a major concern of the program in the language arts today.[2]

The job of the language arts teacher is to improve his students' competencies in the arts of reading, speaking, writing, and listening; and to achieve these ends he is willing to use grammar, literature, writing activities—in short, whatever content seems likely to help reach his goals.

The adolescent that the language arts teacher confronted was to be as thoroughly understood as possible; a sound psychology of adolescence was to undergird the language arts program. In turn, a sound language arts program was to contribute to the development of a healthy personality in the young student. The English classroom, by providing opportunities for a great many experiences in literature, drama, and creative writing, would help the adolescent realize his potential, discover for himself what he really believed.

What then was the role of the language arts teacher in this curriculum? To a large extent, I think, it was that of a friendly guide, one who knew the territory, of course, but one who also was aware of the comfort needs of the traveler. The trick was to reach the destination unharmed, without undue stress or inconvenience. The route to be followed therefore could match, but never challenge or exceed, the assumed capability of the traveler. To succeed, the teacher needed to be skillful at devising alternate routes, a master of methods applying different techniques to engage the interest of indifferent students. No part of the English curriculum was indispensable, he felt, for he saw his role as that of a selector from a rich profusion of instructional materials that would provide meaningful experiences. And he seemed to be less interested in the source and nature of these instructional materials than in discovering how they could best be introduced to engage the concern of the adolescent student.

One could argue, I think, that what the language arts program set out to do, it has done, and done reasonably well, too. Given the enormous diversity of the student population—in social class, intelligence, linguistic experience, ethnic

---

[1] *The English Language Arts in the Secondary School* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956), p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

tradition—the program proved to have a remarkable flexibility, in fact. Paradoxically, this very flexibility in the language arts program masked a deficiency for which it came under increasing attack. For what made it adaptable so readily to the needs of widely differing students was partly its lack of commitment to any supportive academic disciplines. It was this absence of a well-conceptualized content that gradually aroused uneasiness in the profession. The purveyors, after all, should know their product.

Once the profession decided that it was remiss in its conceptualization of the curriculum, it embarked upon a remarkable series of self-flagellations. For openers, recall that the Basic Issues Conference of 1958 called for nothing less than a sweeping revision of the teaching of English from kindergarten through the graduate school. Anyone who has written, or read, any of the introductory sections to the numerous proposals for English institutes, research projects, or curriculum studies knows that this criticism from within continues apace!

In the interval, an aroused political community, exhibiting the Sputnik syndrome, had become willing to promote educational change with a generous infusion of federal money; and curriculum reformers, thus challenged, were quick to explore ways in which meaningful innovations could be developed and incorporated into school programs. Confronted with sudden opportunity, the English profession found the task of curriculum reform a formidable one. There was major disagreement about the individual components of the English curriculum, though by now the dominant view endorsed the tripod long advocated by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board: language, composition, and literature. The incredibly thin preparation many teachers of English had received in their college programs contributed to the disarray into which the curriculum had fallen. More than half of the secondary English classrooms were staffed by teachers who had only minored in English; another disturbingly large number had less than a minor in English, certification regulations in various states setting forth only minimal requirements.

Less publicized, though doubtless of at least equal importance, is the plight of even the best-prepared teachers of English, the full-fledged English majors. Because they have in the main completed their university work several years ago, the current scholarly ferment of discovery and controversy in the various disciplines subsumed under the English curriculum has scarcely touched them. According to a significant national survey reported in the provocative NCTE publication *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, a course in modern English grammar, for example, is required in less than a fifth of the 374 colleges preparing teachers of English.[3] Yet the insights developed by linguists into the ways language is structured have been revolutionary and are fraught with pedagogical promise. The predictive power of transformation theory, moreover, may lead to new psychological insights into the nature of learning as well as into the pupil's ability to manipulate the sentences of his

---

[3] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964).

language. Many teachers still do not appreciate fully the linguists' objections to Latinate descriptions of the syntactic structures of modern English. Without a concept of dialects in English, many teachers are unable to develop in their pupils a sense of appropriateness in speech and writing. Few can draw upon a firsthand acquaintance with the historical developments of modern English in exploring language changes with their classes.

But the curriculum reformer had been thrust into a real predicament: there was now a greater demand for his product than his technology enabled him to provide. In addition, this heightened demand was for quality programs—"excellence" is the catchword now—innovatively directed away from the status quo. Clearly, he had now been challenged to develop demonstrably superior curricula, superior in terms of behavioral outcomes that could be objectively assessed. And the call for excellence was not merely vocal; it was funded. Curriculum development programs in English were stimulated in 1962 as Project English was funded under the Cooperative Research Branch of the U.S. Office of Education. By 1966 a network of twenty-five Curriculum Study and Demonstration Centers had been funded on the strength of the proposals submitted. With the subsequent inclusion of English in the National Defense Education Act, colleges and universities were enabled to bring thousands of practicing English teachers back to campus to continue their education. Further opportunities for inservice education became available through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) and the Higher Education Act (1965). National awareness of the impoverished state of the English curriculum and of English teacher preparation was now being translated into federal support to effect needed changes.

How, we might ask, has the conceptualization of the language component changed as a result of this new, funded research thrust? The most fundamental change, it seems to me, occurred in the *basis* for organizing the material. No longer were terms like student *growth* or *need* crucial concerns; rather, the logic of the discipline was to determine appropriate sequence, and, since each discipline is unique, each subject matter area would be uniquely organized. A corollary of this basis for organizing instruction is the fact that the content was now quite clearly based in the relevant disciplines of linguistics, literary criticism, and rhetoric. Thus the dichotomy between school level activity in language and the research level was heightened; grammar, for example, was flourishing as an area of study and research in college departments of English and linguistics and at the same time languishing in the schools. Indeed, the language arts program had been ambivalent both about the place of grammar in the English curriculum and about the nature of grammar itself. As Gleason observes in *Linguistics and English Grammar*,

> The grammar taught in the American schools had never put much stress on the system. "Functional grammar" and similar movements of the twenties and thirties emphasized its tendencies to atomism. This led to a remarkable development. While the content of the grammar course contracted markedly, the time devoted to grammar shrank much less, if at all. A great deal more time was needed for the material that was retained. As items were deleted from the eighth-grade syllabus they were replaced

> by additional review of points presented in the seventh. The curriculum seemed to be approaching the strange condition of being almost entirely review. This yearly reiteration was necessitated by the failure of students to learn. In turn it aggravated the situation by adding boredom to vacuity.[4]

Consider, again, how widely different are the conceptions of grammar in the schools and grammar in linguistics. As taught in the schools, grammar appears totally divorced from any currently active discipline and is often justified on the ground that it undergirds instruction in good usage and composition—support, incidentally, that it has proven unable to give.

II

Grammar, as the transformationalist understands it, is a system of rules that corresponds to the competence of the native speaker. It is a theory that tries to show how sound and meaning are interrelated by the grammar of a language, how its sentences are formed and understood. Investigating the structure of a theory that deals with sentence formation should increase understanding of language acquisition and language development. The empirical investigation of language acquisition and language development in turn should lead to increased understanding of the logical structure of the theory. How language is learned is a puzzling and controversial topic for the psychologist. And although virtually every child acquires a language, what he does in learning it is nevertheless a remarkable accomplishment. As Chomsky points out in his review of Skinner's book *Verbal Behavior,*

> It is not easy to accept the view that a child is capable of constructing an extremely complex mechanism for generating a set of sentences, some of which he has heard, or that an adult can instantaneously determine whether (and if so, how) a particular item is generated by this mechanism, which has many of the properties of an abstract deductive theory. Yet this appears to be a fair description of the performance of the speaker, listener, and learner. If this is correct, we can predict that a direct attempt to account for the actual behavior of speaker, listener, and learner, not based on a prior understanding of the structure of grammars, will achieve very limited success. The grammar must be regarded as a component in the behavior of the speaker and listener which can only be inferred . . . from the resulting physical acts. The fact that all normal children acquire essentially comparable grammars of great complexity with remarkable rapidity suggests that human beings are somehow specially designed to do this, with data-handling, or "hypothesis-formulating" ability of unknown character and complexity.[5]

Children have more competence in language than the linguist is yet able to describe; that is, they know more grammar than has been codified. Remarkably, however, students in our secondary schools are convinced—and readily admit—that they do not know any grammar. Such lack of confidence in their awareness of how their language works is bound to hamper their use of the language, but, more important, it indicates that they have been misled.

---

[4] H. A. Gleason, Jr., *Linguistics and English Grammar* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 15.

[5] Noam Chomsky, "A Review of B. F. Skinner's *Verbal Behavior,*" in J. Fodor and J. Katz (eds.), *The Structure of Language* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 577.

Since language is probably the most distinctively human characteristic, it should be worth some study for itself. Too often, however, students are required only to learn the terms of what appears to be a closed descriptive system, a system presented as certain, complete, and pedagogically useful—though this usefulness is to follow later, much later. Promises are reassuring, but it is dishonest to present a simplified analysis of English with a certitude that not only ignores the rich complexities of its underlying regularity but in effect denies its existence. The student is disadvantaged by such a curriculum. And so, really, is the teacher. As teachers, we take delight in sharing what we know; we should also be willing to share our ignorance with our students and undertake the study of our language with an open mind. I think Chomsky's observation about the missed opportunity that results from using a limited grammar is relevant here:

> . . . it is important for students to realize how little we know about the rules that determine the relation of sound and meaning in English, about the general properties of human language, about the matter of how the incredibly complex system of rules that constitutes a grammar is acquired or put to use. Few students are aware of the fact that in their normal, everyday life they are constantly creating new linguistic structures that are immediately understood, despite their novelty, by those to whom they speak or write. They are never brought to the realization of how amazing an accomplishment this is, and of how limited is our comprehension of what makes it possible. Nor do they acquire any insight into the remarkable intricacy of the grammar that they use unconsciously, even insofar as this system is understood and can be explicitly presented. Consequently, they miss both the challenge and the accomplishments of the study of language.[6]

The central curricular problem in English language instruction might be formulated in this way: what study program can be developed to help the student become more proficient in creating and interpreting the sentences of his language? He already has a considerable understanding of the phonology and syntax at the intuitive level, and his lexicon has been steadily increasing. Does he need to study grammar in some formal way, then? If, as some claim, the five-year-old child possesses an already complete working knowledge of the grammar of his language, I think the answer is clearly "no." On the other hand, if the performance of school children in the language tasks of writing, or of reading with understanding, betrays some unfamiliarity with the rich resources of the English sentence, then grammar might profitably be studied. It seems to me that in fact the linguistic performance of school children does reveal such unfamiliarity and that therefore a grammar—provided it be adequate—ought to be included in the English curriculum. It's conceivable, however, that the kind of grammar worthy of study in the secondary school is not yet available in sufficient detail for the thinly prepared teacher to risk using. The scientist cannot approach nature in an empty-headed way, with no theoretical frame to guide his question posing. Nor should the teacher of English approach the important study of language without a similar framework to guide him. But what do we ask of this new kind of grammar? As Fillmore puts it,

---

[6] Chomsky, "The Current Scene in Linguistics: Present Directions," *College English*, 27 (May 1966), 595.

> A grammatical description of a language is successful if it accounts for precisely the facility that an ideal speaker of a language has in producing and understanding the grammatical sentences in his language. The knowledge that the speaker brings to bear in exercising this ability may be separated into the *general* and the *specific*. One's *general* knowledge about a language is organized and displayed in its *grammar;* one's *specific* knowledge about the individual linguistic objects known as words or "lexemes" is collected and itemized in a *dictionary* or *lexicon* of the language.[7]

The student may have the semantic information, for example, that the words *averse* and *reluctant* are synonymous; to use them appropriately, however, he must be aware of some additional, syntactic facts. Thus, although both can appear as predicates, only *reluctant* can appear attributively. We have

(1) the reluctant groom, but not
(2) *the averse groom.

Moreover, in the predicate position, one can be used absolutely whereas the other cannot. We can say

(3) the groom was reluctant, but not
(4) *the groom was averse.

Again, in the predicate positions, we find that there is a complementary distribution of permitted completers:

(5) ...reluctant to { marry / *marriage / *marrying } contrasted with

(6) ...averse to { *marry / marriage / marrying }

It is readily apparent that to use and understand these two fairly simple adjectives, students need to know the meanings of the words as well as the conditions under which the words can appropriately be used.

Finally, it seems to me, the skepticism toward the new linguistics held by many so-called traditional teachers is being vindicated. They were, after all, always interested in meaning, and now semantics is one of the hottest topics in transformational generative theory. Linguists like Charles Fillmore, James D. McCawley, John R. Ross, George Lakoff, and D. T. Langendoen are exploring the topic with revolutionary enthusiasm. If the results of this research help develop an English transformational grammar that includes a semantic component, then all of us, English educators, teachers of English, and students of language, are the richer for it. The study of language can take up the puzzling and yet commonplace act by which sound and meaning are related.

---

[7] Charles J. Fillmore, "The Grammar of *Hitting* and *Breaking*," in R. Jacobs and P. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Studies in English Transformational Grammar* (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1968).

Micro-Teaching in English Education: Some Basic Questions

EARL SEIDMAN, *University of Massachusetts*

Micro-teaching is a teacher training technique first developed by Dwight W. Allen and his colleagues at Stanford University. Since its inception, micro-teaching has been adopted by a number of teacher education institutions that have become committed to it as a powerful tool in teacher training. Each institution has developed the concept of micro-teaching in its own way. The model I shall describe and question is the one I became familiar with at Stanford and continue to work with at the University of Massachusetts.

For those of you who have no idea of what micro-teaching is, picture the following situation: as a part of their preservice training, interns in English and other subject areas take part in a micro-teaching clinic. In this clinic, an intern teaches a lesson ranging from five to twenty minutes to a class of four students. Immediately you see that micro-teaching is a scaled-down version of the real world. The number of students and the length of the lesson are drastically reduced. One basic assumption of micro-teaching is that practice in this scaled-down situation will have beneficial effects when the intern meets his own class of thirty students for fifty minutes.

What are the advantages of reducing the length of the lesson and the number of students? First of all, it is economical. For an intern class of 150, approximately fifty secondary students are needed to serve in the micro-teaching clinic. With only fifty such students, the intern has the opportunity to micro-teach at least three times a week, and over a period of eight weeks he gains considerable preservice teaching experience.

Second, the scaled-down situation reduces the complexity of the teaching problems the intern faces without necessarily reducing the difficulty of the situation. The result is an increased focus on the teaching and learning process.

For example, the intern in English when faced with a micro-teaching lesson must first pick one aspect of the language arts that he can teach in five minutes to a group of four or five students. Let us imagine that the idea the intern picks is that of literary point of view. After a little experience, the first thing that the intern will recognize is that he can not possibly teach the concept of literary point of view in five minutes. What then can he teach? What component of the concept can he deal with in five minutes? He may decide that he can have his students recognize that, when the same object is looked at from different physical vantage points, different aspects of the object are seen. Because of the scaled-down nature of his task, the intern is required to analyze the concept he is choosing to teach, break it up into its component parts, and then choose the most effective methods for achieving his objectives.

The result is a highly focused experience for the intern which increases the possibility of his insight into the teaching process.

Another vital aspect of micro-teaching that is a corollary of its highly focused nature is the teach-reteach cycle. Having chosen to teach the idea of point of view, the intern plans his lesson and then teaches it to his four students. Immediately after the lesson, he has the opportunity of discussing the lesson with his supervisor who has observed the micro-class. In the conference, the supervisor may use the comments of the students in the class which they have written on reaction sheets; if the lesson has been videotaped, he may play it back.

After the supervisory conference, the intern attempts to incorporate what he has learned from the discussion as he reteaches his lesson to a different group of four students. The basic pattern of micro-teaching, therefore, is a highly focused teaching experience, a supervisory discussion, a reteach opportunity, and another supervisory discussion. The teach-conference-reteach cycle, which can take place in less than a half hour, is considered one of the most vital and valuable aspects of micro-teaching.

Performance Criteria and Technical Skills

One of the major recent developments in micro-teaching is the concept of technical skills of teaching. Technical skills are behaviors of teachers which when utilized appropriately would lead to the accomplishment of what are called "performance criteria." For example, in English a major performance criterion might be that the intern can lead a discussion of a poem in a way that actively involves his students. To accomplish that performance criterion, the teacher would have to be able to question skillfully. One aspect of questioning is the technical skill called "probing," which can be described as the type of questioning procedures a teacher would use to draw his students beyond their original answers to his question. For example, an intern can learn to ask his students "Why?" "Can you give an example?" "Can you define that?" in such a way that he draws students beyond their first responses to a question.

Other technical skills involved in leading an engaging discussion might be "reinforcement," the ability to reward students in such a way that they are encouraged to contribute more to a discussion. Something that has been given the awful label of "varying the stimulus" is a technical skill which means simply that the intern learns not to stand in one place, speak in the same monotone, and use the same gestures over and over again. The technical skill of "using examples" is thought to be particularly important for an English teacher, who is often involved in discussing abstract concepts which must be brought down to a concrete level if the students are to become intelligently involved in the discussion.

Models

To aid in the training of the intern to perform these technical skills, we have begun to use videotaped models of the technical skills. To produce these model tapes, we ask an experienced teacher to teach a micro-lesson in which he

illustrates the performance of the technical skill. Thus we might have a model tape of a teacher focusing on reinforcing techniques; another model might be on probing techniques, and another on the effective use of illustrations. The intern watches the model tape and then plans his own lesson and practices the skill in the micro-teaching clinic. His practice is usually videotaped, and he can compare his performance with that of the experienced model teacher. The modeling approach has been an effective training device because it frees us from just telling the intern what he should be doing; with the model tape, we can show him.

Supervision

Our experience with micro-teaching has affected our concept of supervising intern teachers. The major insight that we have gained from the micro-teaching experience is that supervision is probably more effective if it is as focused and selective as the micro-teaching experience itself. We have encouraged supervisors to limit their comments to the intern to one area of concern rather than bombarding him with a full-scale critique of all his weaknesses. Even if the intern wanted to, he probably could not change or react to all the things his supervisor traditionally would tell him. By focusing on only one area of concern in any one supervisory conference, we think that we do not so readily destroy the intern's motivation, and that we increase the chance that the intern will be able to act on our suggestions.

Videotapes

Throughout this paper I have alluded to the use of videotapes in the micro-teaching process. In addition to viewing model tapes, each intern is videotaped almost every time he teaches and reteaches. Although micro-teaching can proceed without videotaping, it is a powerful adjunct to the process. It is hard to describe how powerful a tool the videotape is in supervision. Marshall McLuhan gives us a hint as to why it is so powerful. As he would put it, television is a "cool medium" which leads to a great deal of involvement on the part of the viewer. When you add to the medium the fact that the content is the intern's teaching and his students' reactions, you can imagine the involvement with which he watches the videotape. The tool is powerful, and it requires great sophistication on the part of the supervisor to use it wisely.

These developments in micro-teaching are by no means finished products. Much remains to be done to sophisticate the process of micro-teaching. For example, those interested in the training of teachers of English are faced with the enormous task of looking at all the areas of the teaching of English and identifying performance criteria and the technical skills which would enable English teachers to achieve those criteria. Once the skills are identified, they could be integrated into a training process which fully utilizes the strengths of micro-teaching which I have discussed up to this point.

Questioning the Process

The very strengths of micro-teaching which I have discussed lead me to

question whether micro-teaching as I have described it is appropriate for a program of English education. Micro-teaching is an outgrowth of behavioristic psychology. It reflects a behavioristic view of the world. Micro-teaching trains teachers to perform in ways those who are running the program think are good. Like a programed teaching machine, the goals of micro-teaching have been set by those who administer the program; the goals are then analyzed in terms of their component parts, and a pattern is devised that will lead the teacher trainee to perform in the desired way, or at least at some minimal criteria level. The main technique of supervision in the micro-teaching process is to selectively reward or reinforce behaviors which approximate the skills we are trying to teach and to criticize those behaviors which do not lead the trainee to behave in the way we think he should.

Do we want to base micro-teaching on a psychology that has been developed mainly using rats and pigeons as the experimental subjects? Do we want to base micro-teaching on a psychology whose most prestigious advocate says,

> Science is more than the mere description of events as they occur. Science not only describes, it predicts. Nor is prediction the last word; to the extent that the relevant conditions can be altered, or otherwise controlled, the future can be controlled. If we are to use the methods of science in human affairs, we must assume that behavior is lawful and determined. We must expect to discover that what a man does is the result of specifiable conditions, and that once these conditions have been discovered, we can anticipate and to some extent determine his actions.[1]

In short, do we as English educators want to base a micro-teaching program on a psychology whose goal its chief advocate sees as the prediction and control of human behavior? As English educators are we not interested in the freedom of the human animal and not his control?

If we accept behaviorism as the psychological base of micro-teaching, are we not then involved in a program which trains rather than educates? Do we want to be involved in training teachers? If we do, when and how does such training relate to their education? I tend to reject an involvement in training English teachers for a number of reasons. First of all, do we know enough? To be really honest as English educators I think that we would have to admit that we know precious little about what good teaching of English is. At this point would it not be presumptuous for a group of us to get together and decide on a set of skills that our novices should master? Can we pretend that these skills would be the necessary ingredients for good teaching in English for all our trainees? Moreover, can we train our teachers to do what many educators consider to be the really important aspects of teaching? Can we train teachers to be enthusiastic about their work? Can we train them to empathize with their students? Can we train them to respect the opinions of their students? Can we train teachers to commit themselves to continue learning about English? I suggest that the things we can train people to do are really inconsequential when we look at the teaching and learning of English in a broader perspective. In short, I suggest that we do not know enough about

---

[1]B. F. Skinner, *Science and Human Behavior* (New York: Macmillan, 1953), p. 6.

what good teaching is to know whether the skills being defined are necessary, and intuition tells us that they are certainly not sufficient for good teaching.

Even if we grant that we have come up with technical skills and performance criteria which are important to good teaching, I would question whether we should train our students to perform them. By doing so, wouldn't we be perceiving our interns as automatons who could be shaped to behave appropriately? As Peter Wagschal has written in an unpublished article called "Performance versus Experience Based Curricula" (available through the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts),

> We would all agree that human beings can be manipulated, but the question is not one of fact but of value; the question is whether teacher education should be conceived and designed as a comprehensive system of behavioral control. Those who urge the use of performance criteria are taking at least an implicit stand in favor of manipulation towards the behavioral goals they deem desirable. I, on the other hand, would quite explicitly take the reverse stand: insofar as we consciously control the behavior of other people, we may be able to produce beings which perform in manners which we deem adequate, but we are in no way helping to produce human beings.

I would carry this further. Wouldn't you agree that there is a relationship between the type of people we are and the type of teachers we are, between the type of living we do and the type of teaching we do? It seems to me that that relationship is inseparable. Any attempt to train teachers, I think, presupposes an attempt to train human beings to be a type of person. Do we want to be involved in such training?

Another question I have about micro-teaching, as I have seen it developed so far, is the assumptions it makes about teaching and learning *and* about the role of the teacher in the process. Most of the skills that I have discussed, "reinforcement," "probing," "varying the stimulus," presuppose the idea that the teacher's role is to control the students and to direct the class. As those who are training teachers assume that it is their role to control the training of the teachers, the skills developed in micro-teaching reflect the same assumptions operating between the trainee and his future students. If we treat our interns mechanistically, how will they treat their students? As of yet, and I would love to stand corrected, I have seen no skills developed which assume any other role for the teacher than that of controller of the students' behavior. Yet it seems to me that some of the most recent interesting ideas about teaching challenge that concept of the role of the teacher. Those of you who are familiar with Carl Rogers' concept of a teacher as one who facilitates learning by acting as a resource for his students would find it hard to see how that concept of the teacher fits into what has been done in micro-teaching to date.

A purely pragmatic question along these lines of facilitating learning might be whether the highly structured micro-teaching process really does facilitate learning. I am reminded of a conversation between Dean Dwight W. Allen of the University of Massachusetts and Robert Mager which might be entitled "Students are better than we give them credit for being." In that conversation Mager suggested that we encumber students with too much in the way of instruction, assignments, and drills, more than is necessary for them to achieve

the objectives we have for them. He goes on to talk about his by now well-known meter reading experiment. He devised an intricate programed instruction system to teach girls to read complicated electrical meters used to test products on a production line. He found that his programed instructional system did reduce the training time, which previously took a number of days, to an hour and a half. Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your point of view, in the next door laboratory he was doing a learner-controlled instruction experiment. In that experiment the task was the same, but the learner could turn the instructor on and off like a TV set. The students in this group achieved the same criterion level, not in an hour and a half, but in an average of twenty minutes. Those results led him to ask, "How is my program getting in the way of the students?" For those of us working with micro-teaching, it will be imperative that we be sensitive to the possibility that our highly constructed program might be getting in the way of some of our students.

The focus of my question has been on the psychological base of micro-teaching and its mechanistic use as a training procedure. I have no doubt that micro-teaching could be used not just for training English teachers but for educating them. But to do so we would have to forget the precepts of behaviorism and think in terms of education rather than in terms of training.

In educating teachers of English there could not be a presumption to come up with a list of skills which it would be necessary for all of our prospective teachers to perform. Even if we thought we knew of some skills that might be useful, we would object to training our students to perform them; instead, we would present them for their critical examination and let them decide whether they are appropriate for the kinds of teachers that they want to be.

Education as opposed to training presumes an interest in presenting and sharing with students experiences which will lead to self-insight and insight into the relationship between the type of human beings they are and the type of teachers they will be. In a process of education we would be interested in presenting them with experiences which encourage them to develop confidence in what they are and what they want to be, not in experiences in which the focus is on being trained to be what others want them to be.

Basic to education is a faith in the nature of our interns because we assume that they want to be the best they can be. Training, on the other hand, seems to me to say, We will shape you to be what we want you to be; we don't have much confidence in you. Training looks to standardization rather than diversity, constraints and requirements rather than options and freedom.

I hope that I have made it clear that my questioning does not mean that I do not consider micro-teaching a potentially powerful resource in the education of English teachers. The confrontation with smaller numbers of students for shorter periods of time and the use of models and television and focused supervision would be immensely valuable if they were used as a resource available to our prospective teachers rather than as a process they are forced to go through. But the initiative to use these resources must come from the students themselves. I have no doubt whatsoever that a supervisory conference would be more beneficial to the trainee when it is a result of *his* feeling

the need for it rather than that of the supervisor. The same options might profitably be employed throughout the entire program.

The main concern I hope my questions have raised is whether we are using and will use micro-teaching to mould and shape our future teachers or whether we can devise ways of using it which would be more consistent with the aims of an educational experience.

The Well-Prepared Student Teacher

SISTER M. PHILIPPA COOGAN, B.V.M.
Carmel High School for Girls, Mundelein, Illinois

My remarks are limited here to one aspect only of teacher preparation: the practicum. From time to time I have asked beginning teachers what aspects of their program were most valuable to them in the classroom, and almost invariably they have responded, "Student teaching," or "Observation and student teaching," or "The special methods course and student teaching." Yet you and I know that these experiences are really not as fruitful as we would like them to be, and for a variety of reasons. Let me recall to you just a few: a scarcity of outstanding teachers willing to sacrifice their own time and the time of their class to the training of practice teachers; the exigencies of the individual classroom situation, which demand that a particular set of operations be performed at a particular time, regardless of whether or not the student teacher will benefit from the experience; limitation of student teaching to a particular school which may serve an entirely different kind of student than the school to which the young teacher will ultimately be assigned; the impossibility of the supervising teacher's keeping in close touch with all the teaching situations in which his student teachers are involved; and therefore his inability to guide them adequately in identifying good and desirable teaching experiences.

All this refers to observation and student teaching. Now let us consider the methods class itself. The teacher of this course, well aware of the diversity of operations in which his student teachers are engaged or will be engaged, well aware of their urgent need for help, of the complexity of each separate teaching situation, is apt to violate all the principles of pedagogy to which he subscribes in order to give them immediate assistance. He lectures about the ineffectiveness of the lecture method, for instance; he generalizes about the importance of the particularizing or inductive approach; he pontificates about the desirability of learning by discovery.

I should like to see methods classes organized entirely—or almost entirely —along inductive lines. I should like to see most of the class sessions devoted to controlled observation of widely different teaching situations, different as to the kinds of skill and insight that are being developed, different as to the kinds of students being reached, different as to the kinds of teachers serving as catalysts in the learning situation. Since every member of the class will then have observed the same demonstration, they will be able to explore together the principles of psychology and pedagogy involved, with great economy of time and considerable sharpening of focus.

The possibility of setting up classes in this way has dawned on me slowly, partly as a result of experiences at previous CEE meetings: movies of actual classroom teaching, pioneered, I think, by Edmund Farrell; films in which Mar-

jorie Smiley showed ways of using the Gateway literary materials with inner city children; then, last year, the impressive demonstration Dr. Grommon gave of Stanford's use of videotapes in micro-teaching—zeroing in on a particular teaching technique, with the student teacher making a short presentation to a half dozen students, then viewing his performance in the company of his supervising teacher and analyzing its good and weak points, then trying again with another group of students. Not many schools, perhaps, have at present the facilities for developing such teaching materials from scratch, but what a wonderful thing it would be if they were able to build, by purchase or rental, an audiovisual library of live teaching situations, representing, on the whole, presentations of the most successful practitioners of particular skills, not just student teachers' performances.

Presently, not a great deal of outstanding material of the kinds I have mentioned is available, but more is being prepared all the time, and still more will be provided by the universities and the regional research centers as the demand increases.

Let me cite just a few instances of activities in these areas. The Center for Urban Education in New York is building a storehouse of films illustrating good and bad teaching behavior and techniques, designed not only for updating practice of teachers already in the field but also for training beginning teachers.

The micro-teaching program researched at Stanford University is being tested and developed further at the Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory (centering in the Bryant School in Livonia, Michigan) and at the Far West Regional Educational Laboratory at Berkeley. In the Michigan-Ohio Laboratory, Dr. Flanders' interaction analysis is incorporated into the program of student self-evaluation. At the Far West Laboratory, teachers begin their self-evaluation by first watching films illustrating good and bad teaching habits. Then their own classroom performance is videotaped and submitted to critical examination; later, a second taping is done in the classroom. The director of the Laboratory, Dr. John K. Hempkill, reports a miraculous improvement in the skill and behavior of many teachers even within a three-week period.

A further development of the Stanford program at the Far West Laboratory has very great promise indeed. Here, by a delicate shift of metaphor, the Stanford micro-teaching program has evolved into a minicourse described in the *Washington Monitor* of March 18, 1968, as "a self-contained package of inservice training material designed to improve teachers' classroom performance in only four days." Through a series of films, this course presents some twelve specific skills that a teacher can use during a discussion, introducing the skills severally so that a teacher can acquire facility through videotaped micro-teaching. Among the improvements in teacher performance directly attributable to the minicourse is a notable reduction in the amount of time the teacher talks during a class discussion. This course can be used in any school where a videotape system is available.

Finding that few good films were available showing examples of teacher behavior, the Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory of Illinois, near

Chicago, is doing its own films with the intention of putting them into the hands of "continuing education leaders," whom CERLI is training to spread the gospel of self-evaluation.

The Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory at the University of Nebraska and in Kansas City is pioneering programs for student teachers, directing teachers' skills and behavior toward self-directed learning—i.e., toward promoting the pupil's ability to take on education on his own terms. Considerable use is made of self-evaluative techniques in this program, through videotaped classes and critical sessions. The effectiveness of self-evaluation in the improvement of teaching is being tested at the University of Nebraska, with fifteen students using this method and fifteen in a control group.

The focus of the Mid-Continent Laboratory on the *learning process* rather than the *teaching process* is an important corrective for the beginning teacher, who is apt to be more concerned with putting on a virtuoso performance than with what actually happens between the ears of his students.

This leads me to another area of teacher preparation that needs further exploration and extension: the multiplying of opportunities for various kinds of parateaching experiences among student teachers. The prospective teacher can learn a great many lessons useful in the classroom even from baby-sitting jobs, let alone from playground supervision and camp counseling. But even more valuable is the opportunity to act as a tutor-counselor in an Upward Bound program or a similar educational endeavor. The student teacher in such a program is under the grave obligation of establishing and maintaining rapport with cagey, defensive boys and girls, usually of a very different background from his own, and of developing techniques on the spot to meet their particular academic and emotional needs. Such an experience will reveal to the student teacher, possibly for the first time, how wide a spectrum the term "individual differences" may embrace, how slowly the mind absorbs new ideas. More effectively, perhaps, than in any other way, tutoring experiences can lead the young teacher to understand his role as *catalyst* in the learning process. The wise supervising teacher will seek out such job opportunities for his students.

Using the Verbal Reaction Behavior Log (VRBL) as a Basis for Evaluating Student Teachers

GORDON M. A. MORK, *University of Minnesota*

A major problem in evaluating the future members of our profession while they are engaged in their apprenticeship experiences is that of moving beyond the global general halo effect to the specific acts of teaching which are the actual competencies of the truly professional teacher. This article will attempt to present one means of identifying what actually occurs in a classroom, when classroom experiences and events are classified according to the described dimension, and the use of these data for evaluating student teachers and working with them for their improvement.

Good teaching is defined here as the effective guidance of learners through well-selected experiences which lead to the achievement of certain stated objectives. Note that the emphasis here is on *objectives* and the *experiences* which lead to their achievement.

Background

Ever since Flanders made the major breakthrough which resulted in an acceptance of procedures for the specific description of classroom operations as a means of studying teaching, there have been efforts to identify the truly significant aspects of teacher and pupil behavior in the classroom.

Different toilers in the vineyard have used different means of classifying classroom events according to their own particular interests and dedications. It should be emphasized very strongly that all of these possess a certain amount of validity and that no one system makes for a complete identification of what actually goes on in the complex world of the classroom.

This presentation concerns itself with one such procedure. Specifically, it attempts to set forth a procedure which identifies classroom events according to their relationship to the objectives which are usually stated in instructional planning.

Objectives are usually classified in terms of attempts to achieve growth in *understandings,* in *skills,* and in *favorable attitudes.* Such a classification has been used in education for decades, and it continues to be so prevalent as to be almost universal.

Greater impetus to such a way of looking at educational goals was received from the work of Bloom and his colleagues in the preparation of the two excellent little volumes of *The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.* These people prepared books on the cognitive domain and the affective domain which

have served as excellent references for those attempting to understand teaching in this dimension.

Educational Experiences

If objectives can be identified as *cognitive, skill,* and *affective,* it should follow that related educational experiences should be so classified if we are, indeed, trying to relate the experiences of learners to the goals we have set for them. With this in mind an effort was made to classify verbal behavior in the classroom by both teacher and pupils which seemed to be most closely related to achievement of cognitive, affective, and skill objectives.

It is not my purpose here to present the history of the development of this instrument and to relate logically and psychologically verbal experiences in the classroom to the educational goals stated by the teacher. Suffice it to say that the form which is being discussed today took a great deal of time and effort and revision. There was classification and reclassification, and there were many changes. As usual, parsimony emerged with progress, and the form as you see it is much less complicated and involved than were many of its ancestors. As well as individual work, several master's and doctor's dissertations have contributed to the development of this log.

The VRBL

Presented here, then, is the Verbal Reaction Behavior Log (VRBL) for your examination. You will note its major parts. There is a grid on which the observer is to tally the *frequency* of verbal behavior, the unit tallied being the individual sentence or equivalent. The observer notes whether the verbal behavior is by the *teacher* or by a *pupil.* He also indicates whether each is *telling* or *asking.* Finally he identifies the behavior according to the classification system described.

The classification scheme of the log may be described very simply:

I. **Cognitive behaviors** may be classified according to their simplicity or complexity as noted:
   1. at a simple level
   2. at a higher level
   3. in terms of applications

II. **Skill behaviors** are identified as to whether they are
   4. directional and instructional
   5. repetitive performances
   6. altered performances

III. **Affective behaviors**—as to whether they are
   7. rather clearly identifiable personal involvement
   8. positive reinforcement
   9. negative reinforcement

Our experience with supervisors and observers has been that they can be trained effectively by the use of tapes and the like to a high level of inter-observer reliability, and it is then possible to have an excellent record of what has happened in a given classroom during a given period of time.

The observer may use the entire log or he may use but one portion, according to his interest at a particular time. Beginners should certainly use but one or two portions while gaining skill in its use.

Application to Student Teaching

This is not a rating scale; it is not an evaluation form. It is what it says it is, and that is all: a log of what has occurred in a given classroom.

How can student teachers be evaluated from it? Evaluation requires judgment, and such judgment may possibly be drawn from knowing what the teacher's objectives are and then comparing them with what has actually occurred in the classroom.

The log can clearly identify such things as "teacher talk" and "pupil talk." It can clearly identify whether, for example, pupils ever ask any questions. It can also identify whether the teacher, having set, let us say, a cognitive goal for a class period, has spent time in discussion related to the cognitive domain. Have the discussions been high level or low level? Has the class been asked only to give the names of characters in a novel, or has there been attention to meanings and ideas?

Has a usage goal been set? If so, how much effort has been directed toward classroom practice on this usage? Is the practice rote, or is it altered? How often does the pupil have a chance to use his performance? How often has the teacher said, for example, "Now let's write one"? How often has he directed the pupil to put something in a sentence?

Has a goal of appreciation or attitude change been set? If so, to what extent has there been personal and emotional involvement? Has there been positive reinforcement of desired behaviors? How frequent is this in comparison to the number of negatively toned statements used? Has the emotional impact of words been utilized?

Evaluation

From such data one evaluates the performance of a student teacher and uses the log as the basis for discussion of what actually occurred in the classroom. Presented with tallies of actual occurrences, a student teacher is much more impressed than with vague global comments, "You just talk all the time," or "You never get your pupils to ask questions."

The log also helps the student teacher to be aware of specific behaviors which are expected of him. Studies with its use indicate that it is possible for the student teacher, when made aware, to increase the proportion of positive reinforcements and to increase the amount of high-level discussion in comparison with the recitation of facts and names.

As teachers of English you are well aware of the tremendous challenge that you face in improving skills, understandings, and appreciations. You are most cordially invited to utilize the heretofore described instrument as a means of identifying what goes on in your own classroom or in that of a junior or senior colleague.

CLASSROOM VERBAL REACTION BEHAVIOR LOG
(VRBL)

University of Minnesota — Tentative Form D — College of Education

Mork, *et al.*

BROAD INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE OR VERBAL CATEGORY	VERBAL EXPRESSION OF—	SOURCE AND CLASSIFICATION OF VERBAL BEHAVIOR BY			
		TEACHER		PUPIL	
		TELLING	ASKING	TELLING	ASKING
I. COGNITIVE	1. facts, terms, names; concepts; minor ideas and associations				
	2. classifications; principles, generalizations; explanations; major ideas and relationships				
	3. applications; problem solutions, extrapolations, creative ideas				
II. SKILL	4. directions, instructions				
	5. drill, repetitive practice or performance				
	6. altered or varied practice or performance				

CLASSROOM VERBAL REACTION BEHAVIOR LOG (VRBL)—CONT.

University of Minnesota — Tentative Form D — College of Education

Mork, *et al.*

BROAD INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE OR VERBAL CATEGORY	VERBAL EXPRESSION OF—	SOURCE AND CLASSIFICATION OF VERBAL BEHAVIOR BY			
		TEACHER		PUPIL	
		TELLING	ASKING	TELLING	ASKING
III. AFFECTIVE	7. personal involvement or identification				
	8. positively toned or supportive statements of reinforcement or encouragement				
	9. negatively toned reinforcement or verbalization; sarcasm, anger, punishment				

The Preparation of Classroom Teachers for Supervision of Student Teachers

BRYANT FILLION, *Florida State University*

Perhaps we will know more about the problems of supervising teachers when Greenville College, in Illinois, completes its nationwide study of the supervision of student teaching in English as part of the ISCPET project. But I doubt that the following generalizations will be contradicted by the findings: most programs as they are now arranged are quite haphazard in the selection of supervising teachers; they permit very little college control over the student teaching experience; and they offer insufficient help to the supervising teachers and the student teachers.

Certainly the English education specialists in colleges which prepare English teachers are not completely responsible for this situation. For one thing, there are far too few of them to have created such a monumental hodgepodge. But if we may be pardoned for temporarily accepting arrangements as we have found them, we cannot long escape the responsibility for their improvement. The awareness and concern of English education specialists—evident in a number of articles on the care and feeding of supervising teachers—have not, for the most part, led to improvement of student teaching programs. The situation remains, in most places, analogous to an Old Vic production of *Hamlet* in which the choice of an actor to play the melancholy Dane is left largely to chance. Of course, they would prefer an Olivier or a Burton, but perhaps Wally Cox will just have to do.

We can improve student teaching programs by improving our casting. And we can improve our casting by improving the training of supervising teachers, also referred to as critic teachers, directing teachers, and cooperating teachers. I believe that the role of the English education specialists in the colleges is threefold here: first, to establish the framework within which preparation of supervising teachers is possible; second, to identify good potential supervising teachers and encourage their cooperation; and third, to establish programs to train and aid supervising teachers.

First, we must establish the framework within which preparation of supervising teachers is possible. We must recognize that present arrangements for supervision are inadequate, that they are likely to get worse as the number of student teachers increases, and that, if changes are to be made, those now responsible for teacher preparation will have to bring them about. In order to prepare classroom teachers for supervision, we will first have to recognize

the importance of supervisory skills, consider the objectives of the student teaching program, and establish a closer working relationship with English departments and teachers in the public schools.

It is something of a truism that an excellent teacher is not necessarily an excellent supervisor. But it is also true that the skills essential to supervision are essential to good teaching. Except perhaps for those few great teachers with apparently innate abilities, any teacher can improve by increasing his ability to observe, analyze, and evaluate teaching behavior—his own or somebody else's. All teachers need the ability to observe carefully and objectively, with an eye to critical classroom variables. All teachers should be able to evaluate materials, organization, and methods in light of the objectives of a lesson and the students being taught. And all teachers should be aware of alternative methods and techniques with which to approach teaching situations.

Few teachers receive adequate training in these skills, however, and fewer still are able to develop them on their own. They have heard about these skills, but usually in the context of a general education course which seemed too abstract to be meaningful to prospective English teachers. Consequently, their teaching too often appears to be a series of subjective reactions rather than a conscious activity; they are often unable to explain to others why they teach as they do or the process by which they make teaching decisions. And they are more apt to compare the teaching of others than to analyze it. They are unable to offer more than a subjective critique, because they have never learned the techniques of objective evaluation. Their suggestions to student teachers most often come down to an explanation of "how *I* would do it," because their own teaching is all that they have seen since they were students. Certification, for most teachers, signals the end of their observation of other teaching techniques, except for the college lecture, and it is little wonder that few teachers have appreciation or tolerance of a wide variety of teaching styles. The student teacher's problems are seen in light of the supervisor's own classroom experience, combined perhaps with a dash of Mr. Novak or Sidney Poitier.

Perhaps the English education specialist, like most English majors, has shied away from analytical approaches because they smack of quantification or pseudo-objectivity. Most students of the humanities have over-learned Wordsworth's dictum that "we murder to dissect." Although we are seldom sympathetic with a student's plea that analysis ruins his appreciation of literature, we persist in the notion that the enormously complex behavior patterns of teaching are somehow beyond the reach of analysis. When we can free ourselves and our supervising teachers from this prejudice against analysis, we can begin to make progress in their preparation. As far as possible, teaching behavior should be the result of conscious choice rather than unconscious reactions. Clearly many of our unconscious reactions and habits in teaching are good. But perhaps as frequently they are inappropriate or poor, the kinds of teaching habits which plague the mediocre teacher and which in an otherwise good teacher become known politely as his "idiosyncrasies."

Before we in English education can hope to prepare supervising teachers, we must decide more specifically than we have exactly what we expect student

teaching to accomplish. We must delineate the role we wish the supervising teacher to play. Among other things, we must decide what part he is to have in evaluating the student teacher, and what his status is to be as a participant in the teacher preparation program. The ISCPET-Greenville College study should offer some stimulus for consideration of these matters. At present, there is no other major study underway. I believe that a limited study such as the 1964 Urbana-Cleveland conferences on high school English departments could make a valuable contribution. Some such publication as NCTE's *High School Departments of English*,[1] which resulted from those conferences, could be of great help to supervising teachers in English.

Closer contact with secondary school English departments and teachers is a third essential condition for the preparation of supervising teachers. We cannot expect the schools to assume additional responsibilities in teacher preparation without strong encouragement and support from the colleges. Nor can we expect overworked English teachers to obtain specialized training in supervision without the support of their schools. At best, we would be faced with the time-consuming task of persuading teachers, one by one, to prepare themselves to do the profession a favor. The need for closer school-college cooperation and the mutual benefits to be derived from cooperation are often overlooked. For the college department of English education, closer contact with public schools would provide increased numbers of potential supervisors and a wider variety of known situations in which to place student teachers. It would provide more opportunities for our students to observe varying teaching situations and methods. Perhaps most important, it would force the college specialist to keep abreast of things as they are, rather than as they were when he was in the classroom. Educational psychologists may find it possible to speak meaningfully about learning and teaching in the schools on the basis of their reading and their work with rats, but I do not believe we in English education can afford the luxury of losing contact with the realities of secondary school teaching.

To obtain the cooperation of the schools, however, English education departments will have to accept their responsibilities to inservice teachers. Except for specific programs supported by foundations or the NDEA in recent years, our dealings with secondary school English departments have been largely those of a supplier. We have provided certified teachers and various degree programs for professional advancement. But we have not provided other services which these departments need. In return for help with teacher preparation, I believe the schools may rightfully expect possible advantages in recruiting, help in the supervision of beginning teachers, inservice courses, help in the preparation of special teachers, and help with curriculum revision and evaluation. In short, closer cooperation with the schools will require that college specialists free themselves from the bondage to degree programs and begin to think in terms of service programs.

---

[1] Robert J. Lacampagne (ed.), *High School Departments of English: Their Organization, Administration, and Supervision* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965).

The second major responsibility of the English education specialist is to identify good potential supervising teachers and encourage their cooperation. Increased contact with secondary schools will increase our opportunities to identify the kinds of teachers we want, but we should not overlook an important source of supervising teachers available to us now. Each year the colleges graduate a number of very promising English teachers and grant advanced degrees to excellent experienced teachers. Very often, unless these teachers return for further work, we lose track of them, even when they teach in nearby schools. If we extend the services of our department to our recent graduates and attempt to keep up some contact, at least with our best graduates, they might supply us with leads to good teachers in their departments and might even be willing to serve as supervising teachers themselves.

Although our criteria for selecting good potential supervising teachers will depend somewhat on the role we want them to play, there are some obvious guidelines to follow. Basically, we want career teachers with adequate backgrounds in English and the ability to get along with people, teachers who can give some account of, can analyze, their behavior in the classroom. Through the process of observing, questioning, and evaluating, we should be able to identify many potentially good supervising teachers and to obtain some indication of the weaknesses we will have to overcome. We must recognize, as we do with our undergraduates, that although some of our best supervisors may have inherent natural abilities which others lack, many teachers can be trained to do an adequate job of supervision. Even the best supervising teachers make mistakes which might have been avoided with more help from the colleges.

We cannot, in our present situation, hope to encourage teachers' cooperation by financial rewards. The most usual forms of remuneration offered by colleges are free courses, token payments of money, recognition in the form of a listing in the college brochure, and, occasionally, faculty status with the college. Ultimately, our success in obtaining the cooperation of classroom teachers will depend on our success in establishing the conditions I cited earlier. When teachers can see the benefits of supervisory skills to their own teaching, and when schools and English departments enjoy the benefits of more direct work with college specialists, there should be little need for imaginative token rewards to encourage cooperation.

The third major responsibility of the English education specialist is to establish programs to prepare and aid supervising teachers. Several programs have been developed by general education departments to train classroom teachers in the skills of supervision. The underlying assumption is very often the same one which underlies the general methods course: that supervision is supervision, regardless of the subject. Although this may be true on a theoretical level, on the practical level supervision does not occur in a content-free context; training in supervision of English teachers is probably best learned in the context of English education.

The simplest "program" is to offer a course in supervision, usually free, to teachers presently supervising student teachers, but very few colleges offer

even this. Such courses usually establish the role of the supervisor teacher, offer background in the theory of supervision, introduce teachers to tools for analysis of teaching behavior, and point out important variables which should be observed in the classroom.[2]

The Oregon Plan is a more ambitious undertaking, intended to upgrade supervision throughout the state. The initial study identified the following seven weaknesses of supervising teachers:

1. an inability to observe and collect data from classroom events in a systematic, objective way,
2. poor skill in analyzing a teacher's performance,
3. inability to plan sound strategy for conferences,
4. limited ability to discuss performance with students in such a way as to change behavior patterns,
5. the tendency to teach only for content goals, with only incidental attention to skills, attitudes, and processes,
6. inability to help students effectively in planning a lesson or series of lessons,
7. limited ability to deal effectively with problems of interpersonal conflicts.[3]

These weaknesses, which have been cited in other, less comprehensive, studies, are certainly not unfamiliar to college supervisors who have worked with supervising teachers. The Oregon Plan consists of clinics, workshops, conferences, and courses at colleges throughout the state in such skills as the use of various coding systems for analysis of teaching, clinical supervision, interpersonal relations, and assessment of questioning processes.

One study reports the use of micro-teaching units to train supervisors in techniques of observation, analysis, and the conduct of conferences with student teachers.[4] Training programs have also been established in which teachers receive school-college joint appointments for a year, during which time they receive instruction in supervision and work with student teachers.[5]

Preparation of supervising teachers might involve all of these techniques. We are faced with the immediate problem of training teachers who are already supervising, and for these teachers we need efficient and effective ways to "add" skills quickly. Many good prospective supervising teachers who are willing to take specific programs geared to immediate objectives would be unwilling to take general education courses or to embark on full degree programs. Recognizing the importance of supervisory skills to teaching, however, we

---

[2] Wilmer Pautz, "Course for Critic Teachers," *Wisconsin Journal of Education*, 99 (October 1966), 34.

[3] William Ward and John Suttle, "The Oregon Plan to Improve the Induction Process: The Program to Prepare Supervising Teachers and the Organization of Schools and Colleges to Accommodate the Process," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 17 (Winter 1966), 444-451.

[4] Horace E. Aubertine, "The Use of Micro-Teaching in Training Supervising Teachers," *The High School Journal*, 51 (November 1967), 99-106.

[5] *Ibid.*

should also incorporate such preparation in our basic degree programs. The undergraduate who learns early the techniques of critical observation and analysis of teaching procedures in English is more likely to be able to use the skills later, both as a teacher and as a supervisor. Realizing that many of our master's candidates will eventually assume positions of responsibility within their departments, we could fully justify the inclusion of supervisory techniques in an advanced methods course for experienced teachers.

The following objectives, culled largely from general courses in supervision, might serve to guide the construction of a profitable English education program for the preparation of supervising teachers.[6] The program should lead teachers to

1. develop a clear understanding of the objectives of the student teaching program in English,
2. develop strategies for accomplishing these objectives with different types of student teachers,
3. understand clearly the role of the supervising teacher,
4. learn to evaluate method and technique in terms of the material, objectives, and particular students,
5. acquire a working knowledge of various "tools" of analysis, such as the Flanders system of interaction analysis, the Bellack system of examining pedagogical moves, and the Bloom taxonomy of educational objectives,
6. become acquainted with a wide variety of methods and techniques and develop a tolerance of differing teaching styles, primarily through extensive observation,
7. have supervised practice in observation, analysis, and evaluation of teaching,
8. develop skill in conducting conferences with student teachers,
9. update, where necessary, their background in English.

By drawing examples from English teaching, dealing directly with the particular problems of English teaching, and bringing together teachers with a common background and teaching experience, we can make these general objectives increasingly specific. As with the teaching of methods, the more specific and directly applicable we can make our preparation of supervising teachers, the more likely we are to bring about real improvement.

Our responsibility to the supervising teacher does not cease when we have once prepared him, however, any more than our responsibility to the teacher ceases when he receives his teaching certificate. Through the college supervisor, research, and publications we must extend our services to the experienced supervisor as well as to the novice.

I believe that the important first step in improving the supervision of student teaching in English must come with the recognition and acceptance of responsibility by English education specialists. If we hope to prepare our

---

[6] An excellent analysis of the entire practice teaching situation is provided in Judson T. Shaplin, "Practice in Teaching," *Harvard Educational Review*, 31 (Winter 1961), 33-59.

teachers fully, we cannot leave the arrangements for student teaching in their present haphazard state, and we cannot depend on others to correct the situation for us. Overworked and understaffed as departments of English education usually are, it is not surprising that we have avoided acceptance of such additional and far-reaching responsibilities as are posed by the preparation of supervising teaching. But one thing is certain: until we *do* accept the responsibility, little is likely to be done in our behalf.